

**Evaluation of  
Definitions and  
Analysis of  
Comparative Data for  
the School Library  
Statistics Program**

**Evaluation of  
Definitions and  
Analysis of  
Comparative Data for  
the School Library  
Statistics Program**

Gretchen Dickson  
Bureau of the Census

Carrol Kindel, Project Officer  
National Center for Education Statistics

**U.S. Department of Education**

Richard W. Riley

*Secretary*

**Office of Educational Research and Improvement**

C. Kent McGuire

*Assistant Secretary*

**National Center for Education Statistics**

Pascal D. Forgione, Jr.

*Commissioner*

The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) is the primary federal entity for collecting, analyzing, and reporting data related to education in the United States and other nations. It fulfills a congressional mandate to collect, collate, analyze, and report full and complete statistics on the condition of education in the United States; conduct and publish reports and specialized analyses of the meaning and significance of such statistics; assist state and local education agencies in improving their statistical systems; and review and report on education activities in foreign countries.

NCES activities are designed to address high priority education data needs; provide consistent, reliable, complete, and accurate indicators of education status and trends; and report timely, useful, and high quality data to the U.S. Department of Education, the Congress, the states, other education policymakers, practitioners, data users, and the general public.

We strive to make our products available in a variety of formats and in language that is appropriate to a variety of audiences. You, as our customer, are the best judge of our success in communicating information effectively. If you have any comments or suggestions about this or any other NCES product or report, we would like to hear from you. Please direct your comments to:

National Center for Education Statistics  
Office of Educational Research and Improvement  
U.S. Department of Education  
555 New Jersey Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20208-5651

September 1998

The NCES World Wide Web Home Page address is <http://nces.ed.gov>

**Suggested Citation**

U.S. Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics. *Evaluation of Definitions and Analysis of Comparative Data for the School Library Statistics Program*, NCES 98-267, by Gretchen Dickson. Project Officer, Carrol Kindel. Washington, DC: 1998.

Contact:

Jeffrey Williams

(202) 219-1362

## FOREWORD

This report was prepared in the Governments Division of the U.S. Bureau of the Census by Gretchen Dickson. It addresses issues of interest and concern to the National Center for Education Statistics and education policy makers and researchers. An evaluation covering several surveys collecting 1993–94 school library data was conducted. The report contains the results of the analysis of definitions and comparisons of data.

The objective was to determine the accuracy of the data. The items evaluated were: the numbers of schools with library media centers, the levels at which these library media centers are staffed, and the role librarians play in school decision making. This report also contains notes on areas for potential improvement in data collection and processing.

## ABBREVIATIONS IN THIS REPORT

The following abbreviations are used throughout this report:

**CCD—Common Core of Data**—the annual census of basic information about the nation’s public elementary and secondary schools. The CCD consists of three nonfiscal surveys, the Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe, the Public Elementary/Secondary Education Agency Universe, and the State Nonfiscal Survey, and one fiscal survey, the National Public Education Financial Survey. The nonfiscal surveys provide counts of staff and students attending public schools. The fiscal survey is described below.

**LEA—Local Education Agency**—the government agency administratively responsible for providing public elementary and secondary instruction or educational support services.

**LMC—Library Media Center Survey**—the sample surveys of public, private and Bureau of Indian Affairs schools for library media centers. This survey and the Library Media Specialist/Librarian Survey are the main programs evaluated in this report.

**LMS—Library Media Specialist/Librarian Survey**—the sample surveys of public, private and Bureau of Indian Affairs schools for library media specialists. This survey and the Library Media Center Survey are the main programs evaluated in this report.

**NCES—National Center for Education Statistics**—the federal agency responsible for collecting education statistics, including library statistics, on a national scale.

**NPEFS—National Public Education Financial Survey**—this survey collects school finance data for the 50 state education agencies, the District of Columbia and the outlying areas under U. S. jurisdiction. The survey is part of the CCD.

**SASS—Schools and Staffing Survey**—the sample surveys of public (school and local education agency level), private and Bureau of Indian Affairs schools for staffing, programs and policies.

**TDS—Teacher Demand and Shortage Questionnaire for Public School Districts**—the sample Schools and Staffing Survey at the local education agency level for staffing, programs and policies.



Section 3.4A	LMS and SASS Surveys (Public, Private and BIA): Librarian Classification of Main Assignment, and Full-Time and Part-Time Definitions	61
Section 3.4B	LMS and SASS Surveys (Public, Private and BIA): Librarian Classification of Main Assignment Counts	62
Section 3.4C	LMS and SASS Surveys (Public and BIA): Librarian Full-Time and Part-Time Estimates	63
Section 3.5A	LMS and SASS Surveys (Public): Librarian Role in Decision Making Definitions	72
Section 3.5B	LMS and SASS Surveys (Public): Librarian Role in Decision Making Counts	73
Section 3.6A	LMS and CCD State Nonfiscal Survey (Public): Librarian Definitions	76
Section 3.6B	LMS and CCD State Nonfiscal Survey (Public): Librarian Estimates	76
CHAPTER 4. LIBRARY STAFF		79
<i>Library Media Center Surveys Compared to Common Core of Data State Nonfiscal Survey</i>		79
Section 4.0A	LMC and CCD State Nonfiscal Survey (Public): Total Library Staff Definitions	79
Section 4.0B	LMC and CCD State Nonfiscal Survey (Public): Total Library Staff Estimates	80
Section 4.1A	LMC and CCD State Nonfiscal Survey (Public): Other Professional Staff Definitions	86
Section 4.1B	LMC and CCD State Nonfiscal Survey (Public): Other Professional Staff Estimates	87
<i>Library Media Specialist Surveys Compared to National Public Education Financial Survey</i>		90
Section 4.2A	LMS and NPEFS Survey (Public): Library Staff Salary Definitions	90
Section 4.2B	LMS and NPEFS Survey (Public): Library Staff Salary Estimates	90
CHAPTER 5. SUMMARY COMPARISONS		93
Section 5.0	Drawing Conclusions from the LMS Surveys Librarian Data	93
Section 5.1	States Ranked by Key Variables for Public Schools Across Surveys	93
Appendix A.	Discussion of Principal Findings with Qualifications	96
Appendix B.	Description of Methodology	99
Appendix C.	Sampling for the SASS, LMC and LMS Surveys	101
Appendix D.	Scope for the LMC and LMS Surveys -- Counts	104
Appendix E.	Scope for the LMC and LMS Surveys -- Procedure for Assignment	106
Appendix F.	Counts of Library Media Center Staff Across Surveys	107
Appendix G.	Survey Forms	108
BIBLIOGRAPHY		149

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1-1.	School Library Data Comparison: Survey Respondents and Levels of Response .....	8
Table 1-2.	School Library Data Comparison: Scope for the Library Media Center Surveys .....	9
Table 1-3.	School Library Data Comparison: Scope for the Library Media Specialist/Librarian Surveys .....	10
Table 1-4.	School Library Data Comparison: Scope for the Schools and Staffing Surveys .....	11
Table 1-5.	School Library Data Comparison: Summary of Intersurvey Item Agreement and Disagreement for the School-Level Surveys .....	12
Table 2-1.	Library Media Center Counts for Public Schools: The LMC Survey Compared to the SASS Survey for Linked Schools by Scope .....	17
Table 2-2.	Library Media Center Counts for Private Schools: The LMC Survey Compared to the SASS Survey for Linked Schools by Scope .....	18
Table 2-3.	Library Media Center Counts for BIA Schools: The LMC Survey Compared to the SASS Survey for Linked Schools by Scope .....	19
Table 2-4.	Library Media Center Estimates for Public Schools: The LMC Survey Compared to the SASS Survey by State .....	20
Table 2-5.	No Library Media Center Estimates for Public Schools: The LMC Survey Compared to the SASS Survey by State .....	21
Table 2-6.	Library Media Center Estimates for BIA Schools: The LMC Survey Compared to the SASS Survey by State .....	22
Table 2-7.	No Library Media Center Estimates for BIA Schools: The LMC Survey Compared to the SASS Survey by State .....	23
Table 3-1.	State-Certified Library Media Specialists Counts for Public Schools: The LMC Survey Compared to the LMS Survey for In-Scope Linked Schools .....	35
Table 3-2.	State-Certified Library Media Specialists Counts for Private Schools: The LMC Survey Compared to the LMS Survey for In-Scope Linked Schools .....	36
Table 3-3.	State-Certified Library Media Specialists Counts for BIA Schools: The LMC Survey Compared to the LMS Survey for In-Scope Linked Schools .....	37
Table 3-4.	Professional Staff Counts for Public Schools: The LMC Survey Compared to the LMS Survey for In-Scope Linked Schools .....	38
Table 3-5.	Professional Staff Counts for Private Schools: The LMC Survey Compared to the LMS Survey for In-Scope Linked Schools .....	39
Table 3-6.	Professional Staff Counts for BIA Schools: The LMC Survey Compared to the LMS Survey for In-Scope Linked Schools .....	40

Table 3-7.	Part-Time and Full-Time Library Media Specialist/Librarian Counts by Type of School: The LMC Survey Compared to the SASS Survey for In-Scope Linked Schools .....	45
Table 3-8.	Part-Time and Full-Time Library Media Center Aides Counts by Type of School: The LMC Survey Compared to the SASS Survey for In-Scope Linked Schools .....	46
Table 3-9.	Full-Time Library Media Specialist/Librarian Estimates for Public Schools: The LMC Survey Compared to the SASS Survey by State .....	47
Table 3-10.	Part-Time Library Media Specialist/Librarian Estimates for Public Schools: The LMC Survey Compared to the SASS Survey by State .....	48
Table 3-11.	Full-Time Library Aide Estimates for Public Schools: The LMC Survey Compared to the SASS Survey by State .....	49
Table 3-12.	Part-Time Library Aide Estimates for Public Schools: The LMC Survey Compared to the SASS Survey by State .....	50
Table 3-13.	Full-Time Library Media Specialist/Librarian Estimates for BIA Schools: The LMC Survey Compared to the SASS Survey by State .....	51
Table 3-14.	Part-Time Library Media Specialist/Librarian Estimates for BIA Schools: The LMC Survey Compared to the SASS Survey by State .....	52
Table 3-15.	Full-Time Library Aide Estimates for BIA Schools: The LMC Survey Compared to the SASS Survey by State .....	53
Table 3-16.	Part-Time Library Aide Estimates for BIA Schools: The LMC Survey Compared to the SASS Survey by State .....	54
Table 3-17.	Library Media Specialist/Librarian Estimates for Public Schools: The LMC Survey Compared to the SASS TDS Survey by State .....	57
Table 3-18.	Library Media Specialist/Librarian Estimates for Public Schools: The LMC Survey Compared to the CCD State Nonfiscal Survey by State .....	60
Table 3-19.	Full-Time and Part-Time Counts for Library Media Specialists/Librarians by Type of School: The SASS Survey Compared to the LMS Survey for Linked Schools .....	65
Table 3-20.	Librarian Classification of Main Assignment Counts by Type of School: The LMS Survey Compared to the SASS Survey for Linked Schools .....	66
Table 3-21.	Full-Time Library Media Specialist/Librarian Estimates for Public Schools: The LMS Survey Compared to the SASS Survey by State .....	67
Table 3-22.	Full-Time Library Media Specialist/Librarian Estimates for BIA Schools: The LMS Survey Compared to the SASS Survey by State .....	68
Table 3-23.	Part-Time Library Media Specialist/Librarian Estimates for Public Schools: The LMS Survey Compared to the SASS Survey by State .....	69
Table 3-24.	Part-Time, Itinerant or Long-Term Substitute Library Media Specialist/Librarian Estimates for	

	Public Schools: The LMS Survey Compared to the SASS Survey by State .....	70
Table 3-25.	Part-Time Library Media Specialist/Librarian Estimates for BIA Schools: The LMS Survey Compared to the SASS Survey by State .....	71
Table 3-26.	Librarian Involvement in Decision Making Counts and Estimates for Public Schools: The LMS Survey Compared to the SASS Survey .....	74
Table 3-27.	Library Media Specialist/Librarian Estimates for Public Schools: The LMS Survey Compared to the CCD State Nonfiscal Survey by State .....	78
Table 4-1.	Key Definition Differences for Library Media Center Staff: The LMC Survey Compared to the CCD State Nonfiscal Survey .....	82
Table 4-2.	Interpretations of Library Media Center Staff Categories for the CCD State Nonfiscal Survey .....	83
Table 4-3.	Coverage of Library Media Specialists/Librarians' Income: The LMS Survey Compared to the NPEFS Survey .....	84
Table 4-4.	Total Library Media Center Staff Estimates for Public Schools: The LMC Survey Compared to the CCD State Nonfiscal Survey by State .....	85
Table 4-5.	Other Professional Staff Estimates for Public Schools: The LMC Survey Compared to the CCD Nonfiscal State Survey by State .....	89
Table 4-6.	Library Staff Salary Estimates for Public Schools: The LMS Survey Compared to the NPEFS Survey by State .....	92
Table 5-1.	States Ranked Across Surveys by Key Variables for Public Schools: The LMC Survey, the LMS Survey, the CCD State Nonfiscal Survey, the SASS Survey and the SASS TDS Survey .....	95

## CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

### Section 1.0 Objectives

This report addresses the three issues of concern expressed in the report “School Library Media Centers in the United States: 1990–91.”<sup>1</sup> The issues were (1) the numbers of schools with libraries, (2) the levels at which these libraries are staffed, and (3) the role libraries and their staff play in schools.

1. Counts and estimates of library media centers were compared between the Library Media Center (LMC) and the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) surveys. This comparison was done at the school, state and national levels.
2. For library staff, data comparisons were made at various levels:

Counts at the individual school level:

*The LMC and LMS<sup>2</sup> surveys –*  
State-certified library media specialists  
Professional staff members

*The LMS and SASS surveys –*  
Classification of specialists/librarians

*The LMC and SASS surveys –*  
Full-time and part-time specialists/librarians  
Full-time and part-time aides

Estimates at the state and national level:

*The LMC and CCD<sup>3</sup> State Nonfiscal survey –*  
Total library staff  
Library media specialists  
Other professional staff

*The LMS and CCD State Nonfiscal survey –*  
Specialists/librarians

*The LMC and SASS surveys –*

---

<sup>1</sup>U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, *School Library Media Centers in the United States: 1990–91 (Survey Report)*.

<sup>2</sup>Library Media Specialist Survey

<sup>3</sup>Common Core of Data

Full-time and part-time specialists/librarians  
Full-time and part-time aides

*The LMS and SASS surveys –*

Full-time and part-time specialists/librarians

*The LMS and NPEFS<sup>4</sup> surveys –*

Salary estimates

*The LMC and SASS TDS<sup>5</sup> surveys –*

Specialists/librarians

3. The role library media specialists/librarians play in schools was compared. The items compared were: the existence of a decision-making body reported on the SASS survey to librarian involvement in decision making reported on the LMS survey. This was compared at the school and national levels. See Section 3.5A for a description of librarian involvement in decision making.

### Section 1.1 Principal Findings

The principal findings are presented here without qualifications or recommendations. For technical qualifications of these statements, see Appendix A “Principal Findings with Qualifications.” For recommendations, see Section 1.2 “Recommendations.”

1. The LMC survey and the SASS both asked if the school had a library. Most schools reported either “yes” on both surveys, or “no” on both surveys.
2. The LMS survey asked for the respondent’s: (1) state certification, (2) professional degrees and (3) main assignment (i.e., librarian, teacher or administrator). The LMC survey requested counts of: (1) state-certified specialists and (2) degrees. Data on the librarians’ certification, professional status and main assignments were consistent between the LMS and LMC surveys.
3. The SASS survey had instructions for reporting the counts of staff assigned to more than one function or school. The LMC survey did not have these instructions. Analysis suggested the lack of instructions for reporting employees assigned to

---

<sup>4</sup>National Public Education Financial Survey

<sup>5</sup>Teacher Demand and Shortage Questionnaire for Public School Districts

more than one function or school was causing over-reporting on the LMC survey.

4. The LMC survey and the CCD state nonfiscal survey both referred to the resources the library uses. There were notable differences in the resources mentioned and the presentation.
5. The LMC survey and the CCD state nonfiscal survey collected counts of total library staff. The LMC survey state estimates were higher than the CCD state nonfiscal survey state counts. There were several possible reasons for this:
  - different units of collection
  - different levels of reporting
  - different staff definitions
  - the small sample size
6. The LMC survey collected counts of state-certified library media specialists. The CCD state nonfiscal survey collected counts of specialists/librarians, state-certified and nonstate-certified. The LMC survey state estimates of state-certified specialists were higher than the CCD state nonfiscal survey state counts of all specialists/librarians. The different units of collection were a factor. There also could be misreporting between the categories on one or both surveys. The LMC survey estimation may be an issue.
7. The LMC survey collected counts of nonstate-certified librarians and other professionals working in the library together in a category called other professionals. Aides and clerks were counted as other paid employees. The CCD state nonfiscal survey had ambiguous definitions. It appeared the intent was to collect some professionals and all library aides and clerks in a category called library and media support staff. A comparison of the LMC survey other professionals plus other paid employees counts to the CCD state nonfiscal survey's library and media support staff count suggested the surveys were collecting these counts in the intended categories.
8. The CCD state nonfiscal survey counted all librarians, while the LMS survey was completed by only the respondent. The CCD state nonfiscal survey counts should be and were higher than the LMS survey counts for the majority of states. For

states where the LMS survey estimates exceeded the CCD state nonfiscal survey counts, the condition was due to different units of collection, the ambiguous CCD state nonfiscal survey definitions, or an estimation issue for the LMS survey.

9. The LMS survey collected salaries for respondents only. The NPEFS survey collected all librarian staff salaries in one category. For most states, the NPEFS salary group was larger than the LMS survey respondent salaries. For states where the opposite was true, a possible reason was the inclusion of teaching income in the LMS salaries.
10. The LMC survey collected counts of state-certified specialists, other librarians and other professionals.<sup>6</sup> The TDS collected counts of specialists/librarians. The counts from the LMC survey exceeded the TDS counts by an average of 69 percent. This may be due to the difference in units of collection. It also may indicate either many other professionals were working in the library or an estimation issue for the LMC survey data.
11. The SASS survey asked if the school had a formal decision-making team including administrators and teachers. The LMS survey asked if the respondent feels included in decision making. For schools with a team, more than half of the respondents felt included. For all schools, with or without a decision-making team, 67 percent of the librarians felt included in decision making.
12. The LMS survey was useful for drawing conclusions about the role of respondents in schools. It was not useful for drawing inferences about all library staff or how one state's librarians compare to another state's.
13. For each of the public school LMC, LMS, SASS, TDS and CCD state nonfiscal surveys, the states were ranked by the size of their estimates of libraries and specialists/librarians. The rankings were compared across states. The analysis suggested the level of response (librarian, school,

---

<sup>6</sup>*The American Association of School Librarians' position is that librarians must be state certified to be considered librarians. Persons trained as librarians but lacking certification are considered other professionals.*

local education agency or state) makes a difference.

## Section 1.2 Recommendations

The recommendations are based upon the findings. Suggestions for improving the LMC and the LMS surveys are grouped by topic. There are additional recommendations concerning intersurvey consistency.

### *Scope*<sup>7</sup>

1. Consider examining the 57 LMC cases where the data were blanked and the school made out-of-scope because the school was out-of-scope on the SASS survey. Theoretically, out-of-scope schools on the SASS survey were selected for the LMC survey sample because the schools closed during the time lag between samples. It is possible the schools were incorrectly reported as closed if staff responded to the LMC survey. See especially Appendix D.
2. The number of nonresponse and insufficient response cases could be reduced for the LMC and LMS surveys. The LMC survey cases are 8.2 percent of the public school library sample, 18.2 percent of the private school library sample, and 9.4 percent of the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) school library sample. The LMS survey cases are 8.9 percent of the public school library sample, 9.3 percent of the private school library sample, and 9.0 percent of the BIA school library sample.

---

<sup>7</sup>For the LMC survey (LMS survey), in-scopes were schools with libraries (and respondents) and reporting at least certain items. Out-of-scopes were cases where there was no school or no library (or no librarian). If the school did not meet the criteria for out-of-scope or in-scope, then it was a nonrespondent. Nonrespondents included nonresponses and insufficient responses: the school reported a library (librarian), but the remainder of the survey responses were insufficient for inclusion in the tabulated data. Only in-scope schools and out-of-scope schools that reported no library carried weights in the data file.

For the SASS survey, an in-scope school was in operation and was an elementary or secondary school. Out-of-scope schools were no longer in operation or were not elementary or secondary schools. Nonrespondent schools included nonresponses and insufficient responses. Out-of-scope and nonrespondent schools did not carry weights in the data file.

- a. A targeted remail to produce more information should be considered. A letter could be sent with the survey to these cases. The letter would state that our records indicate there is a library or librarian at this school, as appropriate. The letter would ask the recipient to direct the form to the librarian to be completed.

Also, mailing the LMC and LMS surveys in a package to each school for the original and follow-up mail outs may help.

- b. A telephone follow up to determine the scope of schools reporting inconsistencies should be conducted. If a respondent says there is a library or librarian on one survey, but not on another, call.

Through follow up, the analyst would learn how the respondents are interpreting the form or which characteristics of these schools or staff are creating the discrepancies. The analyst could then make form changes. Also, the analyst could ask the respondent to complete another form or obtain the essential missing information<sup>8</sup> over the telephone.

- c. Some consideration should be given to insufficient response cases that reported a library, librarian and other data. Other procedures would keep each of these schools' unique reported data.

3. Collecting and tabulating data for volunteers should be considered. Parent volunteers are instructed not to complete the LMS form. For the 1,609 in-scope private school libraries, there were 953 in-scope librarians. Data from volunteers would present a more accurate picture of the private school library staffing situation.

### **Imputation**

Consider reviewing the logical imputation procedures for the in-scopes. For the current imputation procedure, the SASS survey usually overwrites the LMC survey which overwrites the LMS survey. Logic using the opposite sequence should be developed and tested to

---

<sup>8</sup>Those deemed essential to meet the criteria of "in-scope." See Appendix D.

see if it would be an improvement. Also, the specific problems mentioned in this report should be reviewed. See especially “other findings” in Sections 3.0B, 3.0C and 3.1B.

### **Estimation**

Consider reviewing the estimation procedures. Several comparisons of the data to the SASS or CCD surveys indicated possible estimation issues for the LMC and LMS surveys. The pattern of reporting should be reviewed further. See especially “other findings” in Sections 2.0C, 3.1B, 3.4C, 3.5B and 4.0B.

There was a sometimes a lack of relationship between a school’s weight and its reported data. Assuming a direct relationship between the size of a school and the size of its library, schools with the highest weights should report the fewest personnel, i.e., the schools with the highest weights should represent the smallest schools. This was not always the case.

As evidenced in this report, there were outliers that should be analyzed further. For example, as shown in Table 2-5, Michigan had an estimated 32.5 public schools without libraries according to the LMC survey but 278.3 according to the SASS survey. Three schools (with weights of 123.8, 61.6 and 39.7) represented 225.1 of those 278.3.

In addition, estimates for states with few schools also were highly variable. For example, three Arizona public schools reported no library on the LMC survey, but six did on the SASS survey. All three of the schools on the LMC survey were among the six reporting no library on the SASS survey. These three schools on the LMC survey weighted to 42.6, while the six on the SASS survey weighted to 25.6.

### **Definitions**

Recommendations for the LMC Survey

1. Use the term *library media specialist/librarian*. The LMS survey currently uses this term, while the LMC uses *library media specialist*.
2. Briefly define *professional* in Item 1b. Indicate if *professional* means possession of a degree. If so, also indicate the minimum level of degree. It also might help to explain if the degree must be in library science.

3. Add instructions for allocating part-time staff with more than one function. The instructions on the SASS survey for handling these staff work well. Similar instructions could be used. An alternative is to change the request for full time, three-quarters time, half-time and quarter-time, to: full time in the library; part time in the library; or part time in the library and part time elsewhere in the school.
4. To relate the LMC, LMS, SASS and TDS survey responses, it is necessary to separate the librarians from the other professionals, and the clerks from the aides. On the LMC survey, the staff categories could be: specialists/librarians, other professionals, aides, and clerks. A separate item would ask how many of the specialists/librarians are state certified.
5. Strengthen the suggestion in the instructions that the survey should be completed by the respondent.
6. Specify whether the television studio staff is included in the library staff counts.<sup>9</sup>
7. Consider collecting data in full-time equivalents to match the CCD and TDS surveys. An alternative is to set criteria for the number or range of hours for full-time and part-time staff. This would make responses match more closely between surveys and improve data comparability.

### Recommendations for the LMS Survey

Consider collecting data in full-time equivalents. An alternative is to set criteria for the number or range of hours for full-time and part-time staff.

### **Forms Design**

The LMC survey and LMS survey forms are well designed. The respondent-friendly survey form includes:

- a booklet format
- simple language

---

<sup>9</sup>Note that it was clear on the LMC survey that computer personnel were included but not clear if television personnel were included. For the CCD, it was clear that television personnel were included but not clear concerning computer staff. For the SASS survey, it was not clear if either of these staffs was included.

- plenty of white space
- good use of fonts
- use of check boxes where possible
- clear flow and path
- minimal instructions
- instructions placed with the items as needed

The surveys might, however, be even better received by respondents with a few minor changes:

1. The cover letter for both surveys could generate more interest by stating what is at stake. A statement could be added relating that “Interest has centered in general on the contribution school libraries ought to make to the current education reform movement and in particular, to their potential contribution to the expanding role of computer- and technology-based education<sup>10</sup>.”
2. Rearranging the sections on the LMC survey might enhance response. Basic considerations include: sections should be placed in order of the easier sections followed by the harder sections; more interesting sections should be up front; and the first section should tie in with the cover letter.

The section on technology is a possible first section because it is probably the most interesting. It also links well to the above suggested cover letter statement. It might, however, cause smaller schools to think the survey did not apply to them.

The facilities section would make a good first section because it brings up interesting topics like television production areas and computers. It also is general and simple to answer. It links to the topics suggested above for the cover letter. It would make a lead in for the technology section. A brief, preceding table of contents would clarify that several topics are covered by the survey.

3. There is another advantage to placing the LMC survey facilities and technology sections up front: these sections place the respondent in the frame of mind of considering the entire library not just the room where the books are kept. If the section on

staffing followed these two sections, the accuracy of responses for staffing might improve.

4. On the LMS survey, a notice about confidentiality should appear in the section about perceptions and attitudes toward work. It is possible for attitudinal questions to have a negative influence on response rates. The effect for this survey has not been studied.
5. Respondents are more likely to respond if there is a perceived reward or if they feel involved in the survey. A check box on the LMC and LMS surveys to request a brief of the survey results would be received positively. The statement “If you have any questions. . . .” could be modified to add “or suggestions. . . .” Bold type for this statement encourages questions and suggestions. Perhaps one of the remarks sections could be modified to request suggestions.

#### Additional Recommendations

This report evaluated the LMC and the LMS surveys. There is a direct link, however, between these and the other surveys in this evaluation due to their frames. The CCD surveys are the universe, the SASS surveys are samples of the CCD surveys, and the LMC and LMS surveys are samples of the SASS surveys (see Appendix C). Data items from all surveys are part of the National Center for Education Statistics’ statistical profile of the nation’s school library services. The definitions of data items measuring library services should have intersurvey consistency. The following recommendations are intended to augment this evaluation:

#### Recommendations for the SASS Survey

1. Modify the instructions as needed to treat volunteers in a manner consistent with the LMC, LMS and other surveys.
2. Specify whether the television studio staff is included in the library staff counts.
3. Specify that the computer laboratory staff is included in the library staff counts.
4. Add a brief definition of a library to the item asking if there is one.

---

<sup>10</sup>*U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, School Library Media Centers in the United States: 1990–91 (Survey Report)*

5. Consider collecting data in full-time equivalents. An alternative is to set criteria for the number or range of hours for full-time and part-time staff.

#### Recommendations for the CCD State Nonfiscal Survey

Revise the CCD nonfiscal state survey library staff definitions to coordinate with the LMC survey and the LMS survey definitions. For the CCD state nonfiscal survey definitions:

2. Clarify the definition of *professional*.
2. Review the references to, and significance of, the resources worked with.
3. Specify that computer resource staff is included in the library staff counts.
4. Specify whether clerks are included in the library staff counts.
5. Modify the references to volunteers for intersurvey consistency as needed.

#### Recommendations for the NPEFS Survey

If an objective is to determine the reasonableness of the salaries reported on the LMS survey, add a category to the NPEFS for library staff separately. Note whether library staff includes television studio staff and computer laboratory staff.

### Section 1.3 Background

This report is part of a series of evaluations on the statistical programs covering library services in the nation. These statistical programs cover public, academic, school and special libraries, including federal libraries and library networks. This report evaluates two school library surveys.

The LMC and the LMS surveys are the main surveys collecting school library data. The questionnaires have three versions: public schools, private schools and Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) schools. Public schools are those funded and operated by a local education agency. Private schools are owned privately but may not be operated exclusively in a private home. BIA

schools<sup>11</sup> are those operated by or under contract with the BIA.

#### Description of Surveys

This report compared data collected by several surveys of school libraries. Data from the 1993–94 LMC survey and LMS survey were compared to relevant items collected on the 1993–94 CCD and SASS surveys. These surveys were conducted by the Bureau of the Census and released by the National Center for Education Statistics. The following list describes these surveys:

CCD— the annual census of basic information about the nation’s public elementary and secondary schools. The CCD consists of three nonfiscal surveys, the Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe, the Public Elementary/Secondary Education Agency Universe, and the State Nonfiscal Survey. The nonfiscal surveys provide counts of staff and children attending public schools. Only the state nonfiscal survey is discussed in this report.

There also is one fiscal survey, the NPEFS. The NPEFS is described below.

LMC— the sample surveys of public, private and BIA schools for library media centers. This survey and the LMS survey were the main programs evaluated in this report.

LMS— the sample surveys of public, private and BIA schools for library media specialists. This survey and the LMC survey were the main programs evaluated in this report.

NPEFS— a component of the CCD. School finance data are collected from the 50 state education agencies, the District of Columbia and the outlying areas under U.S. jurisdiction.

SASS— the sample surveys of public (school and local education agency level), private and BIA schools for staffing, programs and policies.

See the bibliography for sources of these surveys.

---

<sup>11</sup>While essentially correct, this is a simplification of the criteria for schools selected for the LMC and LMS Indian School Questionnaires.

## Levels of Data Comparison

Data comparisons were done by type of school (public, private or BIA) as appropriate. Comparisons using the CCD state nonfiscal survey and the NPEFS survey applied to public schools at the state level. These surveys are universe counts. The SASS TDS survey covered public schools at the local education agency level. This survey is a sample. The LMC, LMS and SASS surveys were compared for each of the public, private and BIA school data separately at both the school and state level. These surveys are samples.

State estimates for private schools were not shown due to a lack of statistical validity. Estimation was not intended to create state estimates for private schools. There was, however, a face validity found in the similarity between the public and private school state estimates.

The comparison for librarian involvement in decision making was limited to public schools. Only the public school SASS survey inquired about the existence of decision-making bodies.

## Summaries of Sampling and Scope

Table 1-1, at the end of this chapter, shows the complete list of surveys. It describes the type of school, the respondent, the levels of summary, and whether the survey is conducted as a sample or a universe. Appendix C summarizes the sampling universe and strata for the public and private LMC, LMS and SASS surveys.

Appendices D and E describe the procedures for the classification of scope for the LMC and LMS survey schools. Tables 1-2, 1-3 and 1-4 show the results of the classification of scope. State estimates were tabulated for schools classified under one particular scope, that is, schools meeting certain criteria. For school-level counts, data for all schools were compared in this report, regardless of scope. Situations where the scope for a school differs between surveys are of interest in this report.

Table 1-5 summarizes intersurvey item agreement and disagreement for the school-level surveys. The data item, surveys compared, school type and percentages for agreement and disagreement are shown.

## Viewpoint of the Evaluation

The evaluation was conducted as an operational review, that is, the data were reviewed from the survey manager's perspective. The evaluation asked if the LMC and LMS surveys' data could be reconciled to each other or to data from surveys requesting similar information. Findings from comparisons can be used to improve the surveys at the operational level for the next time.

Comparisons were set up to detect hidden but significant data characteristics. For example, if a school reported two librarians on one survey, did it report the same on another survey? Looking at the data different ways, such as school to school, state to state, or survey to survey, can reveal indications of problems or show consistency of reporting and estimation. Such analysis can anticipate data user questions. Estimation issues were referenced for further analysis by research staff.

Appendix B describes the evaluation methodology. Appendix G shows copies of the survey forms.

## Format of this Report

Selected data items from the LMC and LMS survey series were analyzed. Comparison of the survey definitions to definitions for similar items on other surveys is discussed. This is followed by data comparisons for the items across surveys. Both school and state aggregate data comparisons are shown. Estimation, imputation and scope are examined in detail. Intersurvey item agreement and disagreement are highlighted.

**Table 1-1. School Library Data Comparison: Survey Respondents and Levels of Response**

<b>Survey</b>	<b>Type of School</b>	<b>Level of Response</b>	<b>Levels of Summary</b>	<b>Sample or Universe</b>
Library Media Center Survey - Public School Questionnaire (LMC)	public	school	school, state, national	sample of schools from SASS survey
Library Media Center Survey - Private School Questionnaire (LMC)	private	school	school, national	sample of schools from SASS survey
Library Media Center Survey - Indian School Questionnaire (LMC)	BIA	school	school, state, national	universe
Library Media Specialist/Librarian Survey - Public School Questionnaire (LMS)	public	respondent	school, state, national	sample of schools from SASS survey
Library Media Specialist/Librarian Survey - Private School Questionnaire (LMS)	private	respondent	school, national	sample of schools from SASS survey
Library Media Specialist/Librarian Survey - Indian School Questionnaire (LMS)	BIA	respondent	school, state, national	universe
Common Core of Data - State Nonfiscal Survey (CCD)	public	state education agency	state, national	universe of all states
Common Core of Data - National Public Education Financial Survey (NPEFS)	public	state education agency	state, national	universe of all states
Schools and Staffing Survey - Public School Questionnaire (SASS)	public	school	school, state, national	sample of all schools
Schools and Staffing Survey - Private School Questionnaire (SASS)	private	school	school, national	sample of all schools
Schools and Staffing Survey - Indian School Questionnaire (SASS)	BIA	school	school, state, national	universe
Schools and Staffing Survey - Teacher Demand and Shortage Questionnaire for Public School Districts (TDS)	public	local education agency	LEA, state, national	sample of all LEAs

Abbreviations:

- BIA = Bureau of Indian Affairs
- LEA = Local Education Agency
- SASS = Schools and Staffing Survey

Note:

All surveys are for the 1993–94 school year.

**Table 1-2. School Library Data Comparison: Scope for the Library Media Center Surveys**

Survey	Scope	Schools			
		By Scope		Total	
		Counts	Estimates	Counts	Estimates
LMC Public	In-scope	4,242	77,573.0	5,026	80,839.6
	Nonrespondent - reported a library	350	0		
	Nonrespondent- no response	63	0		
	Out-of-scope - reported no library	184	3,266.7		
	Out-of-scope - no response	187	0		
LMC Private	In-scope	1,609	19,311.0	2,535	23,428.8
	Nonrespondent - reported a library	360	0		
	Nonrespondent - no response	101	0		
	Out-of-scope - reported no library	262	4,117.8		
	Out-of-scope - no response	203	0		
LMC BIA	In-scope	127	141.4	160	152.4
	Nonrespondent - reported a library	15	0		
	Nonrespondent - no response	0	0		
	Out-of-scope - reported no library	10	11.1		
	Out-of-scope - no response	8	0		

Abbreviations:

BIA = Bureau of Indian Affairs

LMC = Library Media Center Survey

Notes:

For the LMC survey, in-scopes are schools with libraries and reporting at least certain items. Out-of-scopes are cases where there is no school or no library. All reported data for the out-of-scopes were blanked except responses of no to "Does this school have a library media center?" If the school does not meet the criteria for out-of-scope or in-scope, then it is a nonrespondent. Nonrespondent cases are nonresponse and insufficient response cases. For these forms, the school has a library, but the remainder of the survey responses are insufficient for inclusion in the tabulated data. Only in-scope schools and out-of-scope schools that reported no library carried weights in the data file. Weights for nonrespondents are redistributed to the in-scopes.

<b>Table 1-3. School Library Data Comparison: Scope for the Library Media Specialist/Librarian Surveys</b>					
<b>Survey</b>	<b>Scope</b>	<b>State-Certified Respondents</b>			
		<b>By Scope</b>		<b>Total</b>	
		<b>Counts</b>	<b>Estimate</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>Estimate</b>
LMS Public	In-scope	1,945	36,121.5	3,068	36,121.5
	Nonrespondent - responded "yes," a librarian	11	0		
	Nonrespondent - no response	261	0		
	Out-of-scope - responded "yes," a librarian	5	0		
	Out-of-scope - responded "yes," a librarian with a different main assignment	291	0		
	Out-of-scope - no response	555	0		
LMS Private	In-scope	953	8,182.6	2,348	8,182.6
	Nonrespondent - responded "yes," a librarian	5	0		
	Nonrespondent - no response	213	0		
	Out-of-scope - responded "yes," a librarian	0	0		
	Out-of-scope - responded "yes," a librarian with a different main assignment	376	0		
	Out-of-scope - no response	801	0		
LMS BIA	In-scope	82	94.7	144	94.7
	Nonrespondent - responded "yes," a librarian	1	0		
	Nonrespondent - no response	12	0		
	Out-of-scope - responded "yes," a librarian	0	0		
	Out-of-scope - responded "yes," a librarian with a different main assignment	20	0		
	Out-of-scope - no response	29	0		

Abbreviations:

BIA = Bureau of Indian Affairs

LMS = Library Media Specialist/Librarian Survey

Note:

Reference to "librarian with a different main assignment" means the respondent is the librarian but considers another duty to be the main assignment.

For the LMS survey, in-scopes are schools with libraries and librarians and reporting at least certain items. Out-of-scopes are defined as cases where there is no school, no library or no librarian. If the school does not meet the criteria for out-of-scope or in-scope, then it is a nonrespondent. Nonrespondent cases are defined as nonresponse and insufficient response cases. For these forms, the school has a library and librarian, but the remainder of the survey responses are insufficient for inclusion in the tabulated data. Only in-scope schools carried weights in the data file. Weights for nonrespondents are redistributed to the in-scopes.

**Table 1-4. School Library Data Comparison: Scope for the Schools and Staffing Surveys**

Survey	Scope	Schools			
		By Scope		Total	
		Count	Estimate	Count	Estimate
SASS Public	In-scope	8,767	80,740.1	9,825	80,740.1
	Nonrespondents	765	0		
	Out-of-scope	293	0		
SASS Private	In-scope	2,585	26,093.4	3,353	26,093.4
	Nonrespondents	489	0		
	Out-of-scope	279	0		
SASS BIA	In-scope	152	153.0	160	153.0
	Nonrespondents	7	0		
	Out-of-scope	1	0		

Abbreviations:

BIA = Bureau of Indian Affairs

SASS = Schools and Staffing Survey

Note:

For the SASS survey, an in-scope school is in operation and is an elementary or secondary school. Out-of-scope schools are no longer in operation, or are not elementary or secondary schools. Nonrespondent schools include nonresponse and insufficient response cases. Out-of-scope and nonrespondent schools did not carry weights in the data file. Weights for nonrespondents are redistributed to the in-scopes.

**Table 1-5. School Library Data Comparison: Summary of Intersurvey Item Agreement and Disagreement for the School-Level Surveys**

Data Item	Surveys Compared	School Type	Comparison between Surveys of Linked Schools' Reporting			
			Percentage Disagreement	Percentage Agreement	Not Comparable	Reference Table
State-Certified Library Media Specialists/ Librarians	LMC survey to LMS survey	public	4.2	79.9	15.9	3-1
		private	9.6	66.5	23.9	3-2
		BIA	8.4	74.7	16.9	3-3
Professional Library Media Specialists/ Librarians	LMC survey to LMS survey	public	5.2	78.8	16.0	3-4
		private	10.2	66.0	23.8	3-5
		BIA	4.2	78.9	16.9	3-6
Library Media Centers	LMC survey to SASS survey	public	0.0	88.5	11.5	2-1
		private	1.1	75.5	23.4	2-2
		BIA	0.0	94.4	5.6	2-3
Full-Time Library Media Specialists/ Librarians	LMS survey to SASS survey	public	8.8	82.3	8.9	3-19
		private	18.4	77.0	4.6	3-19
		BIA	5.3	91.2	3.5	3-19
Part-Time Library Media Specialists/ Librarians	LMS survey to SASS survey	public	25.9	63.3	10.8	3-19
		private	17.4	70.0	12.6	3-19
		BIA	25.0	56.3	18.7	3-19

Abbreviations:

- BIA = Bureau of Indian Affairs
- LMC = Library Media Center Survey
- LMS = Library Media Specialist/Librarian Survey
- SASS = Schools and Staffing Survey

Notes:

Linked: Linked schools are those matching by identification number between surveys. The schools are on each survey's mailing list, that is, sample.

Not comparable: Responses were not comparable due to nonresponse on one or both surveys.

## CHAPTER 2. LIBRARY MEDIA CENTERS

### Section 2.0A LMC and SASS Surveys (Public, Private and BIA): Library Definitions

#### Definitions and Items

##### LMC

The LMC survey library media center definition, which appears at the beginning of the survey form was:

“For this survey, a library media center is defined as an organized collection of printed and/or audiovisual and/or computer resources which [a] is administered as a unit, [b] is located in a designated place or places, and [c] makes resources and services available to students, teachers, and administrators. It is this definition, not the name, that is important; it could be called a library, media center, resource center, information center, instructional materials center, learning resource center, or some other name.”

The LMC survey then asked:

“Does this school have a library media center?”

##### SASS

There was no definition for a library media center on the SASS surveys. The SASS survey item was:

“Does this school have a library media center or library?”

#### Discussion

The data for linked<sup>12</sup> schools indicated that the presence or absence of a definition for the library made little or no difference. The data also indicated that the terms “library media center” and “library” were interchangeable from the respondent’s viewpoint. In Section 2.0C, however, the data for all schools presented a different picture. Perhaps the linked schools used or were aware of the LMC survey definition when completing the SASS survey.

---

<sup>12</sup>Linked schools were those that matched by identification number between surveys. The schools were on both surveys’ mailing lists, that is, sample.

#### Related Report Sections

See Sections 2.0B and 2.0C.

### Section 2.0B LMC and SASS Surveys (Public, Private and BIA): Library Counts

#### Comparison

The LMC survey was compared to the SASS survey for the counts of library media centers.

#### Hypothesis

Each school’s responses were expected to be the same on both surveys.

**Principal Finding:** There was high agreement between the surveys for the reporting of libraries.

#### Tables

Tables 2-1 through 2-3 compare responses for schools on both the LMC survey and the SASS survey samples (linked schools). The schools could be either in-scope or out-of-scope.

#### Items

See Section 2.0A.

#### Results in a Nutshell

For linked schools, there was a high rate of intersurvey agreement. Direct disagreement between the linked schools was nonexistent for the public and BIA schools. There was little disagreement for the private schools. The linked data suggested the presence or absence of a definition for the library made little difference.

The estimates in Section 2.0C, however, suggested the opposite.

#### Basic Findings

##### Public School Findings

Table 2-1 contains all of the basic findings. The following table describes the LMC schools in Table 2-1.

The LMC Survey Public Schools

Scope	Presence of a Library			
	yes	no	no response	Total
in-scope	4,242	0	0	4,242
nonrespondent <sup>13</sup>	350	0	63	413
out-of-scope	0	184	187	371
Total	4,592	184	250	5,026

The following points can be deduced from Table 2-1. Note that each total relates to the total line above.

- Of the 4,592 LMC schools with a library, 4,293 (93.5 percent) reported a library on the SASS survey, and 299 (6.5 percent) had no response.
- Of the 184 LMC schools with no library, 155 (84.2 percent) reported no library on the SASS survey, and 29 (15.8 percent) had no response.
- Of the 250 LMC schools with no response, 11 (4.4 percent) reported no library on the SASS survey, and 239 (95.6 percent) had no response or were out-of-scope.

#### Private School Findings

Table 2-2 contains all of the basic findings. The following table describes the LMC schools in Table 2-2.

The LMC Survey Private Schools				
Scope	Presence of a Library			
	yes	no	no response	Total
in-scope	1,609	0	0	1,609
nonrespondent <sup>13</sup>	360	0	101	461
out-of-scope	0	262	203	465
Total	1,969	262	304	2,535

The following points can be deduced from Table 2-2. Note that each total relates to the total line above.

- Of the 1,969 LMC schools with a library, 1,732 (88.0 percent) reported a library on the SASS survey, 28 (1.4 percent) reported no library, and 209 (10.6 percent) had no response.
- Of the 262 LMC schools with no library, 182 (69.5 percent) reported no library on the SASS survey, and 80 (30.5 percent) had no response.
- Of the 304 LMC schools with no response, one reported a library, (0.3 percent) six (1.9 percent) reported no library on the SASS survey, and 297 ( 97.7 percent) had no response or were out-of-scope.

#### BIA School Findings

Table 2-3 contains all of the basic findings. The following table describes the LMC schools in Table 2-3.

The LMC Survey BIA Schools				
Scope	Presence of a Library			
	yes	no	no response	Total
in-scope	127	0	0	127
nonrespondent <sup>13</sup>	15	0	0	15
Out-of-scope	0	10	8	18
Total	142	10	8	160

The following points can be deduced from Table 2-3. Note that each total relates to the total line above.

- Of the 142 LMC schools with a library, 141 reported a library on the SASS survey, and one had no response.
- Of the 10 LMC schools with no library, all reported no library on the SASS survey.
- Of the eight LMC schools with no response, one reported no library on the SASS survey, and the remaining seven were out-of-scope.

<sup>13</sup>Includes partial respondents.

## Intersurvey Agreement and Disagreement

### Intersurvey Agreement

There was a high rate of intersurvey agreement for all schools. There were 4,448 (88.5 percent of all LMC survey public schools) public school cases that clearly agreed in response between surveys. For private schools, there were 1,914 (75.5 percent) cases where the responses on the two surveys clearly agreed. There were 151 (94.4 percent) BIA schools where the responses on the two surveys clearly agreed.

### Intersurvey Disagreement

Direct disagreement (i.e., one said “yes,” the other “no”) between the schools was nonexistent for the public and BIA schools, and almost nonexistent for the private schools. There were 28 (1.1 percent of all private LMC survey schools) private school cases where the LMC survey reported a library, while the SASS survey did not.

## Other Findings

### Classification of Scope

The processing specifications required that if the SASS survey classified the school as out-of-scope, then the LMC survey was made out-of-scope. There were 57 cases where this occurred. Because the data were blanked for out-of-scopes, the data for these cases were not included in these comparisons.

### Imputation

If the SASS survey school had no response to the question inquiring about the presence of a library, the LMC survey was used to impute for that item<sup>14</sup>. This occurred for in-scopes, but not for nonrespondents<sup>15</sup>. Thus, the information that 299 public, 209 private and one BIA nonrespondent LMC survey schools reported a library was not used for imputation to the SASS survey nonrespondents.

## Section 2.0C LMC and SASS Surveys (Public and BIA): Library Estimates

---

<sup>14</sup>SASS Specification Memorandum 94-32

<sup>15</sup>Includes partial respondents.

## Comparison

The LMC survey was compared to the SASS survey for estimates of libraries.

## Hypothesis

The estimates between surveys should be equal for the public and BIA schools.

**Principal Findings:** There was high agreement between the surveys for reporting the presence of libraries. The reporting between surveys for schools with no library, however, was less consistent.

## Tables

Tables 2-4 through 2-7 show the estimates of libraries for the LMC and SASS surveys by state and by type of school.

## Items

See Section 2.0.

## Results in a Nutshell

The estimates were in high agreement for schools reporting a library.

Some LMC survey state estimates of schools reporting no library were notably lower than the SASS survey estimates. If the estimates alone were examined, the conclusion would be the lack of a library definition on the SASS survey is causing confusion. Findings in Section 2.0B, which examined counts, indicated the opposite.

## Basic Findings

The reporting for schools with libraries showed high agreement between the LMC survey and the SASS survey. For the public schools, estimates were close for all states with a national LMC survey/SASS survey ratio of 100 percent. For the BIA schools, the ratio was 100 percent.

For schools reporting no libraries, the LMC survey national estimate was 77 percent of the SASS survey estimate for the public schools and 90 percent for the BIA schools. The state ratios ranged from 0.12 to 2.33

for the public schools and 0.80 to 1.10 for the BIA schools.

### **Other Findings**

#### Estimation

The variances were notable for the data of public schools reporting no library. Michigan had a LMC

survey/SASS survey ratio of 0.12. Michigan had an estimated 32.5 schools without libraries according to the LMC survey but approximately 278.3 according to the SASS survey. Three schools with weights of 123.8, 61.6 and 39.7 represented 225.1 of the 278.3 estimate.

Data for states with small estimates also was highly variable. For example, three Arizona public schools on the LMC survey reported no library, and six on the SASS survey. All three of the schools on the LMC survey were among the six reporting no library media center on the SASS survey. These three schools on the LMC survey weighted to 42.6, while the six on the SASS survey weighted to 25.6.

**Table 2-1. Library Media Center Counts for Public Schools:  
The Library Media Center Survey Compared to the Schools and Staffing Survey  
for Linked Schools by Scope, 1993-94**

<b>LMC Survey Response</b>	<b>SASS Survey Response</b>	<b>Count of LMC Survey Schools</b>	<b>Percent of Total Count</b>
In-scope:	In-scope:		
Yes	Yes	3,948	78.6
Yes	No	0	0.0
In-scope:	Nonrespondent:		
Yes	No response	294	5.8
Nonrespondent:	In-scope:		
Yes	Yes	345	6.8
Yes	No	0	0.0
Nonrespondent:	Nonrespondent:		
Yes	No response	5	0.1
No response	No response	63	1.3
Out-of-scope:	In-scope:		
No	Yes	0	0.0
No	No	155	3.1
No response	No	11	0.2
Out-of-scope:	Nonrespondent:		
No	No response	29	0.6
No response	No response	7	0.1
Out-of-scope:	Out-of-scope:		
No response	No response	169	3.4
<b>Total Schools</b>		<b>5,026</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Abbreviations:

LMC = Library Media Center Survey

SASS = Schools and Staffing Survey

Notes:

Linked = Linked schools are those that match by identification number between surveys. The schools are on both surveys' mailing lists, that is, sample.

In-scope = For the LMC survey, the school reported a library and sufficiently completed the form. For the SASS survey, the school is in operation and is an elementary or secondary school.

Nonrespondent = For the LMC survey, the school has a library, but the remainder of the survey responses are insufficient for inclusion in the tabulated data. For the SASS survey, the school meets the in-scope criteria, but the remainder of the survey responses are insufficient for inclusion in the tabulated data.

Out-of-scope = For the LMC survey, there is no school or no library. For the SASS survey, the school is not in operation or is not an elementary or secondary school.

Source: 1993-94 Library Media Center Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)  
1993-94 Schools and Staffing Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

**Table 2-2. Library Media Center Counts for Private Schools:  
The Library Media Center Survey Compared to the Schools and Staffing Survey  
for Linked Schools by Scope, 1993-94**

LMC Survey Response	SASS Survey Response	Count of LMC Survey Schools	Percent of Total Count
In-scope:	In-scope:		
Yes	Yes	1,392	54.9
Yes	No	27	1.1
In-scope:	Nonrespondent:		
Yes	Yes	1	0.0
Yes	No response	189	7.5
Nonrespondent:	In-scope:		
Yes	Yes	339	13.4
Yes	No	1	0.0
No response	Yes	1	0.0
No response	No	4	0.2
Nonrespondent:	Nonrespondent:		
Yes	No response	20	0.8
No response	No response	96	3.8
Out-of-scope:	In-scope:		
No	Yes	0	0.0
No	No	182	7.2
No response	No	2	0.0
Out-of-scope:	Nonrespondent:		
No	No response	80	3.2
No response	No response	6	0.2
Out-of-scope:	Out-of-scope:		
No response	No response	195	7.7
Total Schools		2,535	100.0

Abbreviations:

LMC = Library Media Center Survey

SASS = Schools and Staffing Survey

Notes:

Linked = Linked schools are those that match by identification number between surveys. The schools are on both surveys' mailing lists, that is, sample.

In-scope = For the LMC survey, the school reported a library and sufficiently completed the form. For the SASS survey, the school is in operation and is an elementary or secondary school.

Nonrespondent = For the LMC survey, the school has a library, but the remainder of the survey responses are insufficient for inclusion in the tabulated data. For the SASS survey, the school meets the in-scope criteria, but the remainder of the survey responses are insufficient for inclusion in the tabulated data.

Out-of-scope = For the LMC survey, there is no school or no library. For the SASS survey, the school is not in operation or is not an elementary or secondary school.

Source: 1993-94 Library Media Center Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)



**Table 2-3. Library Media Center Counts for Bureau of Indian Affairs Schools:  
The Library Media Center Survey Compared to the Schools and Staffing Survey  
for Linked Schools by Scope, 1993-94**

LMC Survey Response	SASS Survey Response	Count of LMC Survey Schools	Percent of Total Count
In-scope:	In-scope:		
Yes	Yes	126	78.8
Yes	No	0	0.0
In-scope:	Nonrespondent:		
Yes	No response	1	0.1
Nonrespondent:	In-scope:		
Yes	Yes	15	9.4
Yes	No	0	0.0
Out-of-scope:	In-scope:		
No	Yes	0	0.0
No	No	10	6.3
No response	No	1	0.1
Out-of-scope:	Out-of-scope:		
No response	No response	7	4.4
Total Schools		160	100.0

Abbreviations:

LMC = Library Media Center Survey

SASS = Schools and Staffing Survey

Notes:

Linked = Linked schools are those that match by identification number between surveys. The schools are on both surveys' mailing lists, that is, sample.

In-scope = For the LMC survey, the school reported a library and sufficiently completed the form. For the SASS survey, the school is in operation and is an elementary or secondary school . . .

Nonrespondent = For the LMC survey, the school has a library, but the remainder of the survey responses are insufficient for inclusion in the tabulated data. For the SASS survey, the school meets the in-scope criteria, but the remainder of the survey responses are insufficient for inclusion in the tabulated data

Out-of-scope = For the LMC survey, there is no school or no library. For the SASS survey, the school is not in operation or is not an elementary or secondary school.

Source: 1993-94 Library Media Center Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)  
1993-94 Schools and Staffing Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

**Table 2-4. Library Media Center Estimates for Public Schools:  
The Library Media Center Survey Compared to the Schools and Staffing Survey  
by State, 1993-94**

<b>By Alphabetical State Order</b>				<b>By Descending LMC/SASS Ratio</b>	
	<b>LMC Survey</b>	<b>SASS Survey</b>	<b>LMC/SASS</b>	<b>LMC/SASS</b>	
	<b>(C1)</b>	<b>(C2)</b>	<b>(C1/C2)</b>	<b>(C1/C2)</b>	
United States	77,573.0	77,216.9	1.00	United States	1.00
Alabama	1,273.8	1,240.4	1.03	Michigan	1.08
Alaska	451.5	428.3	1.05	Alaska	1.05
Arizona	1,018.3	1,031.4	0.99	Kansas	1.03
Arkansas	1,060.0	1,084.0	0.98	Idaho	1.03
California	6,938.9	6,871.2	1.01	Tennessee	1.03
Colorado	1,294.5	1,303.5	0.99	New Mexico	1.03
Connecticut	898.6	912.5	0.98	Alabama	1.03
Delaware	156.2	158.8	0.98	Washington	1.02
District of Columbia	151.7	152.9	0.99	Massachusetts	1.02
Florida	2,261.4	2,278.0	0.99	Kentucky	1.02
Georgia	1,723.2	1,723.2	1.00	Montana	1.02
Hawaii	228.8	228.7	1.00	Missouri	1.02
Idaho	560.6	542.9	1.03	South Carolina	1.01
Illinois	3,701.7	3,665.8	1.01	New York	1.01
Indiana	1,826.1	1,827.8	1.00	California	1.01
Iowa	1,490.1	1,490.3	1.00	Illinois	1.01
Kansas	1,450.2	1,403.7	1.03	Pennsylvania	1.01
Kentucky	1,327.4	1,301.5	1.02	Virginia	1.01
Louisiana	1,362.2	1,370.3	0.99	Wisconsin	1.01
Maine	647.2	666.0	0.97	South Dakota	1.01
Maryland	1,185.3	1,185.3	1.00	Rhode Island	1.01
Massachusetts	1,509.0	1,476.4	1.02	North Carolina	1.00
Michigan	3,122.2	2,880.8	1.08	Hawaii	1.00
Minnesota	1,413.8	1,443.0	0.98	Vermont	1.00
Mississippi	888.8	895.8	0.99	Maryland	1.00
Missouri	2,064.5	2,032.8	1.02	Georgia	1.00
Montana	896.1	881.2	1.02	Iowa	1.00
Nebraska	1,274.7	1,277.4	1.00	Indiana	1.00
Nevada	346.9	354.8	0.98	Nebraska	1.00
New Hampshire	412.4	407.3	1.01	Ohio	1.00
New Jersey	2,026.5	2,066.8	0.98	Oregon	1.00
New Mexico	646.5	628.4	1.03	Louisiana	0.99
New York	3,761.9	3,717.2	1.01	Colorado	0.99
North Carolina	1,892.4	1,885.6	1.00	Florida	0.99
North Dakota	521.4	531.7	0.98	District of Columbia	0.99
Ohio	3,535.4	3,548.8	1.00	Mississippi	0.99
Oklahoma	1,675.5	1,694.7	0.99	Oklahoma	0.99
Oregon	1,176.5	1,181.0	1.00	Arizona	0.99
Pennsylvania	2,976.5	2,947.8	1.01	Connecticut	0.98
Rhode Island	279.6	277.8	1.01	Wyoming	0.98
South Carolina	1,065.4	1,052.4	1.01	Delaware	0.98
South Dakota	651.1	646.5	1.01	North Dakota	0.98
Tennessee	1,521.8	1,475.2	1.03	New Jersey	0.98
Texas	5,440.1	5,578.6	0.98	Minnesota	0.98
Utah	634.7	651.4	0.97	Arkansas	0.98
Vermont	318.2	318.2	1.00	Nevada	0.98
Virginia	1,647.1	1,634.1	1.01	Texas	0.98
Washington	1,746.7	1,705.0	1.02	Utah	0.97
West Virginia	722.2	769.9	0.94	Maine	0.97
Wisconsin	2,008.2	1,994.0	1.01	West Virginia	0.94
Wyoming	389.4	395.7	0.98	New Hampshire	0.85

Abbreviations:

LMC = Library Media Center

SASS = Schools and Staffing Survey

Source:

1993-94 Library Media Center Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

1993-94 Schools and Staffing Survey data file (U. S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

**Table 2-5. No Library Media Center Estimates for Public Schools:  
The Library Media Center Survey Compared to the Schools and Staffing Survey  
by State, 1993-94**

By Alphabetical State Order				By Descending LMC/SASS Ratio	
LMC Survey	SASS Survey	LMC/SASS		LMC/SASS	
(C1)	(C2)	(C1/C2)		(C1/C2)	
United States	2,968.9	3,832.7	0.77	United States	0.77
Alabama	0.0	33.3	0.00	Oregon	2.33
Alaska	26.6	48.3	0.55	Nevada	1.85
Arizona	42.6	25.6	1.66	Arizona	1.66
Arkansas	24.0	0.0	0.00	Texas	1.45
California	364.8	447.7	0.81	Wyoming	1.42
Colorado	31.5	25.2	1.25	West Virginia	1.37
Connecticut	29.3	51.4	0.57	Maine	1.34
Delaware	13.1	10.5	1.25	New Jersey	1.31
District of Columbia	8.0	6.8	1.17	Oklahoma	1.28
Florida	28.0	69.6	0.40	Colorado	1.25
Hawaii	5.6	5.7	0.99	Delaware	1.25
Idaho	12.1	29.7	0.41	North Dakota	1.24
Illinois	182.6	218.5	0.84	District of Columbia	1.17
Indiana	42.6	40.9	1.04	Nebraska	1.15
Iowa	27.4	27.3	1.00	Mississippi	1.11
Kansas	0.0	46.4	0.00	Ohio	1.11
Kentucky	0.0	25.9	0.00	Louisiana	1.11
Louisiana	84.0	76.0	1.11	Indiana	1.04
Maine	74.0	55.3	1.34	Iowa	1.00
Massachusetts	169.1	212.4	0.80	Hawaii	0.99
Michigan	32.5	278.3	0.12	Utah	0.95
Minnesota	44.1	49.2	0.89	Minnesota	0.89
Mississippi	68.4	61.4	1.11	Rhode Island	0.89
Missouri	18.0	49.6	0.36	Pennsylvania	0.84
Montana	0.0	16.0	0.00	Illinois	0.84
Nebraska	21.5	18.7	1.15	North Carolina	0.83
Nevada	19.1	10.3	1.85	California	0.81
New Hampshire	16.5	37.7	0.44	Virginia	0.80
New Jersey	168.6	128.3	1.31	Massachusetts	0.80
New Mexico	15.0	34.3	0.44	New York	0.76
New York	141.8	186.5	0.76	South Dakota	0.63
North Carolina	34.7	41.8	0.83	Washington	0.59
North Dakota	53.8	43.4	1.24	Connecticut	0.57
Ohio	96.8	87.2	1.11	Alaska	0.55
Oklahoma	87.8	68.6	1.28	South Carolina	0.55
Oregon	7.5	3.2	2.33	New Mexico	0.44
Pennsylvania	152.0	180.7	0.84	New Hampshire	0.44
Rhode Island	15.4	17.2	0.89	Idaho	0.41
South Carolina	15.6	28.6	0.55	Florida	0.40
South Dakota	9.5	14.9	0.63	Missouri	0.36
Tennessee	0.0	46.6	0.00	Wisconsin	0.27
Texas	449.5	311.0	1.45	Michigan	0.12
Utah	21.8	22.8	0.95	Kansas	0.00
Virginia	51.2	64.2	0.80	Arkansas	0.00
Washington	60.1	101.3	0.59	Alabama	0.00
West Virginia	176.0	128.3	1.37	Tennessee	0.00
Wisconsin	5.4	19.8	0.27	Montana	0.00
Wyoming	21.4	15.1	1.42	Kentucky	0.00

Abbreviations:

LMC = Library Media Center

SASS = Schools and Staffing Survey

Source:

1993-94 Library Media Center Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

1993-94 Schools and Staffing Survey data file (U. S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

**Table 2-6. Library Media Center Estimates for Bureau of Indian Affairs Schools:  
The Library Media Center Survey Compared to the Schools and Staffing Survey  
by State, 1993-94**

<b>By Alphabetical State Order</b>				<b>By Descending LMC/SASS Ratio</b>	
	<b>LMC Survey</b>	<b>SASS Survey</b>	<b>LMC/SASS</b>	<b>LMC/SASS</b>	
	<b>(C1)</b>	<b>(C2)</b>	<b>(C1/C2)</b>	<b>(C1/C2)</b>	
United States	141.4	141.9	1.00	United States	1.00
Arizona	44.3	48.1	0.92	Montana	2.10
California	1.4	1.0	1.36	California	1.37
Florida	1.2	2.0	0.58	Michigan	1.23
Iowa	1.1	1.0	1.12	Oregon	1.22
Kansas	1.0	1.0	0.93	Minnesota	1.19
Louisiana	1.1	1.0	1.08	Utah	1.16
Michigan	1.3	1.0	1.23	North Carolina	1.13
Minnesota	3.7	3.1	1.19	Iowa	1.12
Mississippi	1.0	1.0	1.02	Wisconsin	1.11
Montana	2.1	1.0	2.10	Louisiana	1.08
Nevada	1.2	2.0	0.58	Wyoming	1.06
New Mexico	38.5	37.1	1.04	Oklahoma	1.04
North Carolina	2.3	2.0	1.13	New Mexico	1.04
North Dakota	10.9	11.0	0.99	South Dakota	1.04
Oklahoma	2.1	2.0	1.04	Mississippi	1.02
Oregon	1.2	1.0	1.22	North Dakota	0.99
South Dakota	19.0	18.4	1.04	Kansas	0.93
Utah	1.2	1.0	1.16	Arizona	0.92
Washington	3.6	4.0	0.90	Washington	0.90
Wisconsin	2.2	2.0	1.11	Nevada	0.58
Wyoming	1.1	1.0	1.06	Florida	0.58

Abbreviations:

LMC = Library Media Center  
SASS = Schools and Staffing Survey

Source:

1993-94 Library Media Center Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)  
1993-94 Schools and Staffing Survey data file (U. S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

<b>Table 2-7. No Library Media Center Estimates for Bureau of Indian Affairs Schools: The Library Media Center Survey Compared to the Schools and Staffing Survey by State, 1993-94</b>					
<b>By Alphabetical State Order</b>				<b>By Descending LMC/SASS Ratio</b>	
	<b>LMC Survey</b>	<b>SASS Survey</b>	<b>LMC/SASS</b>	<b>LMC/SASS</b>	
	<b>(C1)</b>	<b>(C2)</b>	<b>(C1/C2)</b>	<b>(C1/C2)</b>	
United States	10.0	11.1	0.90	United States	0.90
Idaho	1.0	1.0	0.98	Minnesota	1.10
Minnesota	1.1	1.0	1.10	Idaho	0.98
New Mexico	2.7	3.0	0.90	Washington	0.98
South Dakota	3.2	4.0	0.80	Wisconsin	0.93
Washington	1.0	1.0	0.98	New Mexico	0.90
Wisconsin	1.0	1.0	0.93	South Dakota	0.80

Abbreviations:

LMC = Library Media Center  
SASS = Schools and Staffing Survey

Source:

1993-94 Library Media Center Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)  
1993-94 Schools and Staffing Survey data file (U. S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

## Section 2.1 LMC and CCD State Nonfiscal Survey (Public): Library Definitions

### Definitions and Items

#### *LMC*

The LMC survey library media center definition, which appears at the beginning of the survey form was:

“For this survey, a library media center is defined as an organized collection of printed and/or audiovisual and/or computer resources which [a] is administered as a unit, [b] is located in a designated place or places, and [c] makes resources and services available to students, teachers, and administrators. It is this definition, not the name, that is important; it could be called a library, media center, resource center, information center, instructional materials center, learning resource center, or some other name.”

The LMC survey then asked:

“Does this school have a library media center?”

#### *CCD*

The library definition was implied from these definitions:

“Librarians and Media Specialists - C04

Librarians are those professional staff members and supervisors who are assigned specific duties and school time to professional library service activities, including:

selecting, acquiring, preparing, cataloging, and circulating books and other printed materials; planning the use of the library by students, teachers and other members of the instructional staff; and guiding individuals in their use of library books and material, whether maintained separately or as a part of an instructional materials center.”

“Library and Media Support Staff - C05

Library support staff are those staff members who render other professional library services, including selecting, preparing, caring for, and making available to members of the instructional staff the equipment, films, filmstrips, transparencies, tapes, TV programs and

similar materials, whether maintained separately or as part of an instructional materials center.

- INCLUDE activities in the audio visual center, TV studio, and related work-study areas, and services provided by audiovisual personnel.
- INCLUDE library aides and those involved in Library/Media support”

### Discussion

The LMC survey collected counts of libraries. The CCD state nonfiscal survey did not. Thus, no comparison could be made for counts of libraries. Nonetheless, it was useful to compare the definitions of a library because this affects related responses.

The LMC survey referred to a collection of printed, audiovisual and computer resources. The CCD state nonfiscal survey’s definition of librarians and media specialists referred to “books and other printed materials.” Audiovisual resources were referenced under the library and media support staff definition. Computer resources were not mentioned.

The descriptions of the locations of resources were the same for the two surveys with the exception of a reference to classroom collections. The LMC survey, in the introductory general instructions, excluded “Classroom collections (materials located in teachers’ classrooms and not administered by the library media center).” The CCD state nonfiscal survey indicated library resources could be maintained separately. This could be understood to include classroom collections. It was unlikely, however, that non-library staff whose duties include ordering classroom books would be misconstrued to be classified as librarians or library media specialists.

### Related Report Sections

See Sections 3.3A, 3.3B, 4.0A, 4.0B, 4.1A and 4.1B.

## **Section 2.2 LMS and CCD State Nonfiscal Survey (Public): Library Definitions**

### **Definitions and Items**

#### *LMS*

The LMS survey used the same definition of libraries as the LMC survey. See Section 2.1.

#### *CCD*

See Section 2.1.

### **Discussion**

Counts of libraries were not collected on either the LMS survey or the CCD surveys. No comparison was performed. As discussed in Section 2.1, there were notable differences in references to the types of resources. These differences affected the definitions of library staff.

### **Related Report Sections**

See Sections 3.6A and 3.6B.

## CHAPTER 3. LIBRARY MEDIA SPECIALISTS AND LIBRARY AIDES

### *Library Media Center Surveys Compared to the Library Media Specialist Surveys*

#### **Section 3.0A LMC and LMS Surveys (Public, Private and BIA): Librarian State Certification and Professional Definitions**

##### **Definitions and Items**

###### *LMC*

- LMC Item 1a = “How many state-certified library media specialists work in this school’s library media center?”
- LMC Item 1b = “How many professional staff members working in this school’s library media center are NOT certified as library media specialists?”

###### *LMS*

- LMS Item 2 = “How do you classify your MAIN assignment at THIS school (i.e., the activity at which you spend MOST of your time) this school year?”
- LMS Item 12 = “Do you have a bachelor’s degree?”
- LMS Item 13a = “Do you have a master’s degree?”
- LMS Item 14a = “Do you have any other type of degree?”
- LMS Item 14b = list of : Associate degree; Education specialist or professional diploma; or Doctorate or first professional diploma.
- LMS Item 17a = “Are you certified as a library media specialist by this state?”

##### **Discussion**

The LMC survey collected counts of library media specialists.<sup>16</sup> The LMS survey requested the form be completed by the “school employee who is responsible for this school’s library media center, that is, the library media specialist or librarian.” Effectively, there was no difference between the surveys for the definitions of a library media specialist. The presentation, however, differed notably.

For library staff, the LMC survey collected separate counts of state-certified library media specialists<sup>17</sup>, other professionals and nonprofessionals. It implied that library media specialists may or may not be state certified in Item 1a. The library media specialist was assumed to be a professional as indicated by Item 1b. All counts must be for paid staff.

The LMS survey did not indicate any criteria for specialists/librarians in Item 2, a request for the respondent’s main assignment. In subsequent Items 12, 13a, 14a and 14b, it separated the professionals by asking if the respondent has a degree. Item 17a asked if the respondent was state certified as a library media specialist.<sup>18</sup> Respondents may be paid staff or volunteers.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup>*The terms library media specialist and librarian are considered interchangeable according to the National Center for Education Statistics report “School Library Media Centers in the United States 1990–91.” For this report, the two terms were considered interchangeable. In the LMS survey, the terms were presented as library media specialist/librarian throughout the report, except for one question that asked if the respondent was state certified as a specialist. The LMC survey used only the term library media specialist and not the term librarian.*

<sup>17</sup>*Specialists certified in a state other than the one in which they work were reported as other professionals. There would be a small number of these. For this report, all specialists were assumed to be certified in the state in which they work.*

<sup>18</sup>*The item asked if the respondent was certified in the state where the respondent worked. For this report, specialists were assumed to be certified by the state in which they work.*

<sup>19</sup>*Parent volunteers were instructed not to continue with the survey after completing the request for the respondent’s main assignment.*

The LMC survey implied that a professional may have an associate, bachelor's, master's or doctoral degree. The possession of any of these degrees was considered professional for these comparisons. Note, however, that the American Association of School Librarians and the Association of Educational Communications and Technology consider the master's degree in library and information science and related fields to be the entry-level degree for a professional school librarian.

Looking at the findings in Section 3.0B, the high agreement between survey responses for state certification suggests most respondents realized that "library media specialist" and "librarian" were interchangeable terms. The contradictory responses could be because school non-library staff completed the LMC survey and did not know their librarian also was a library media specialist.

The findings in Section 3.0C showed similar rates of agreement and disagreement for responses concerning professional training. Because the inquiries were presented in different formats, differences in response were due more to the way respondents go about completing the form than a definitional or layout problem. Some disagreement may have been due to the LMC survey respondents not bothering to check library staff personnel files for degrees. Instead, they indicated what they thought was correct. Some disagreement, however, may have occurred because the LMC survey did not define the term "professional," leaving the respondent to make assumptions.

When comparing data for these two surveys, it is important to recognize the different subjects surveyed. The LMS and LMC surveys were both sent to the same sample of schools. The LMC survey collected data for the school's entire library media staff. The LMS survey covered only the library media specialist/librarian at a school.

### **Related Report Sections**

See Sections 3.0B and 3.0C.

### **Section 3.0B LMC and LMS Surveys (Public, Private and BIA): Librarian State Certification Counts**

### **Comparison**

The LMC survey was compared to the LMS survey for the number of state-certified library media specialists by type of school.

### **Hypothesis**

The count of state-certified library media specialists for the LMS survey should be equaled or exceeded by the count for the LMC survey. This is because the LMS survey covers only the respondent.

### *A Reverse Look*

### **Hypothesis**

If a school reports one or more state-certified library media specialists on the LMC survey, then there should be a completed LMS survey with a response of "yes" for state certification.

***Principal Finding:*** The reporting between the surveys for state certification of library media specialists was fairly consistent.

### **Tables**

Tables 3-1 and 3-2 show the comparison results for schools that were in-scope on both surveys.

### **Items**

See Section 3.0A for LMC Item 1a and LMS Item 17a.

### **Results in a Nutshell**

The results were inconclusive, that is, no definite conclusions could be made about the data. The levels of agreement and disagreement were not high enough to declare clear results. Input from data users would be needed to establish criteria for results.

### **Basic Findings**

#### **Public School Findings**

Table 3-1 contains all of the basic findings. The following table describes the LMS schools in Table 3-1.

The LMS Survey Public Schools				
Scope	Presence of a State-Certified Librarian			Total
	yes	no	no response <sup>20</sup>	
in-scope	1,627	318	0	1,945
nonrespondent	0	0	272	272
Total	1,627	318	272	2,217

The following points can be deduced from Table 3-1. Note that each total relates to the total line above.

- For the 1,627 LMS state-certified librarians, 1,550 (95.3 percent) of their schools reported one or more state-certified librarians on the LMC survey, 18 (1.1 percent) reported no state-certified librarians, and 59 (3.6 percent) had no response.
- For the 318 LMS respondents that were not state certified, 221(69.5 percent) of their schools reported no state-certified librarians on the LMC survey, 75 (23.6 percent) reported at least one, and 22 (6.9 percent) had no response.
- For the 272 LMS forms with no response, 128 (47.1 percent) of these schools reported one or more state-certified librarians on the LMC survey, 19 (7.0 percent) reported no state-certified librarians, and 125 (46.0 percent) had no response.

Out-of-scope schools are not listed on Table 3-1. There were 371 public schools that were out-of-scope on both surveys. There also were 480 public schools that were out-of-scope on the LMS survey but in-scope on the LMC survey. Of these, 262 reported zeros for the number of state-certified specialists on the LMC survey, 123 had no response, and 95 schools reported one or more state-certified specialists.

#### *A Reverse Look*

There were 1,753 public schools that reported at least one state-certified library media specialist on the LMC survey. For these, 1,550 (88.4 percent) respondents were state-certified library media specialists per the

---

<sup>20</sup>These data were blanked for nonrespondents (nonrespondents and partial respondents).

LMS survey, 75 (4.3 percent) reported that they were not state-certified specialists, and 128 (7.3 percent) had no response. Of the 75 that were not state certified according to the LMS survey, all were librarians or specialists, although not state certified.

#### Private School Findings

Table 3-2 contains all of the basic findings. The following table describes the LMS schools in Table 3-2.

The LMS Survey Private Schools				
Scope	Presence of a State-Certified Librarian			Total
	yes	no	no response <sup>20</sup>	
in-scope	366	587	0	953
nonrespondent	0	0	218	218
Total	366	587	218	1,171

The following points can be deduced from Table 3-2. Note that each total relates to the total line above.

- Of the 366 LMS state-certified librarians, 342 (93.4 percent) of their schools reported one or more state-certified librarians on the LMC survey, nine (2.5 percent) reported no state-certified librarians, and 15 (4.1 percent) had no response.
- Of 587 the LMS respondents that were not state-certified, 437 (74.4 percent) of their schools reported no state-certified librarians on the LMC survey, 104 (17.8 percent) reported at least one, and 46 (7.8 percent) had no response.
- Of 218 the LMS forms with no response, 23 (10.6 percent) of these schools reported one or more state-certified librarians on the LMC survey, 71 (32.6 percent) reported no state-certified librarians, and 124 (56.9 percent) had no response.

Out-of-scope schools are not listed on Table 3-2. There were 465 private schools that were out-of-scope on both surveys. There also were 712 private schools that were out-of-scope on the LMS survey but in-scope on the LMC survey. Of these, 416 had zeros for the number of state-certified specialists, 264 had no response, and

32 schools reported one or more state-certified specialists.

*A Reverse Look*

There were 469 private schools that reported at least one state-certified library media specialist on the LMC survey. For these, 342 (72.9 percent) respondents were state-certified library media specialists according to their LMS survey responses, 104 (22.2 percent) were not state-certified specialists, and 23 (4.9 percent) had no response. Of the 104 that were not state certified according to the LMS survey, all reported that they were librarians or specialists.

**BIA School Findings**

Table 3-3 contains all of the basic findings. The following table describes the LMS schools in Table 3-3.

The LMS Survey BIA Schools				
Scope	Presence of a State-Certified Librarian			Total
	yes	no	no response <sup>21</sup>	
in-scope	61	21	0	82
nonrespondent	0	0	13	13
Total	61	21	13	95

The following points can be deduced from Table 3-3. Note that each total relates to the total line above.

- Of the 61 LMS state-certified librarians, 57 (93.4 percent) of their schools reported one or more state-certified librarians on the LMC survey, one (1.6 percent) reported no state-certified librarians, and three (4.9 percent) had no response.
- Of the 21 LMS respondents that were not state-certified, 14 (66.7 percent) of their schools reported no state-certified librarians on the LMC survey, and seven (33.4 percent) reported at least one.

---

<sup>21</sup>These data were blanked for nonrespondents (nonrespondents and partial respondents).

- Of the 13 LMS forms with no response, five (38.5 percent) of these schools reported one or more state-certified librarians on the LMC survey, four (30.8 percent) reported no state-certified librarians, and four (30.8 percent) had no response.

Out-of-scope schools are not listed on Table 3-3. There were 18 BIA schools that were out-of-scope on both surveys. There also were 31 public schools that were out-of-scope on the LMS survey but in-scope on the LMC survey. Of these, 17 had zeros for the number of state-certified specialists, eight had no response, and six schools reported one or more state-certified specialists.

*A Reverse Look*

There were 69 BIA school respondents that have at least one state-certified library media specialist on the LMC survey. For these, 57 (82.6 percent) reported state certification on the LMS survey, seven (10.1 percent) were not state certified, and five (7.2 percent) had no response. Of the seven that were not state certified according to the LMS survey, all were librarians or specialists.

**Intersurvey Agreement and Disagreement**

**Intersurvey Agreement**

The percentage of survey responses that agreed<sup>22</sup> (considering nonrespondent status on the LMS and LMC surveys to be equivalent to a response of “no”) was 87.4 percent for the public schools, 87.1 percent for the private schools, and 83.2 percent for the BIA schools. Discounting the nonrespondents, 79.9 percent of the public schools, 66.5 percent of the private schools, and 74.7 percent of the BIA schools had matching responses.

For the 1,627 public schools with state-certified library media specialists completing the LMS survey, 95.3 percent knew when completing the LMC survey that their librarian was a state-certified library media specialist. For both private and BIA schools, the ratio was 93.4 percent each.

**Intersurvey Disagreement**

---

<sup>22</sup>Assuming that if anyone in the library was state certified, then the librarian also would be.

The percentage of survey responses that clearly contradicted each other (“yes” versus “no”) was 4.2 percent for the public schools, 9.6 percent for the private schools, and 8.4 percent for the BIA schools.

For the 318 public, 587 private and 21 BIA in-scope schools without a state-certified library media specialist completing the LMS form, 75 (23.6 percent of the 318) of the public, 104 (17.7 percent of the 587) of the private, and seven (33.3 percent of the 21) of the BIA LMC survey respondents thought the librarian was a state-certified library media specialist when they are not. For 75 of these 318 public, 104 of these 587 private, and seven of these 21 BIA school cases, the person completing the LMS survey verified status as a library media specialist or a librarian, but not state certification.

### Other Findings

#### Nonrespondents

The number of cases where the LMC survey indicated at least one state-certified library media specialist, but the LMS survey was a nonrespondent, was notable: 5.8 percent for the 2,217 public schools, 2.0 percent for the 1,171 private schools, and 5.3 percent for the 95 BIA schools. The number of cases where the LMS survey respondent indicated state certification, but the LMC survey was a nonrespondent, was 2.7 percent for the public schools, 1.3 percent for the private schools, and 3.2 percent for the BIA schools.

#### Classification of Scope

According to the processing specifications, if the LMC survey school was out-of-scope, the related LMS survey record also was classified as out-of-scope. There should not be and were no cases where the LMC survey school was out-of-scope and the LMS survey school was in-scope.

There were, however, schools that were in-scope and reported state-certified specialists on the LMC survey but were out-of-scope on the LMS survey. This situation was not dealt with in the edits. A legitimate cause for this situation was a certified specialist considers another duty to be the main assignment.

#### Imputation

Responses concerning state certification were imputed<sup>23</sup> from the LMS survey to in-scope records on the LMC survey if the SASS survey met certain criteria. The criteria for the SASS survey were that the count for both part-time and full-time specialists/librarians must be greater than or equal to zero, and there must be exactly one part-time or full-time librarian reported<sup>24</sup> (prior imputation theoretically replaces nonresponses for these SASS survey items with data or zeros).

If the SASS criteria were met, imputation from the LMS survey replaced nonresponses on the LMC survey total count for state-certified specialists/librarians. For a “yes” LMS response, imputation replaced a nonresponse for the LMC survey with a one (1). For a “no” LMS response, imputation replaced a nonresponse for the LMC survey with zero (0). This left any reported data intact.

There were cases where imputation did not occur because the schools’ SASS survey responses did not meet the criteria for imputation:

There were 59 nonrespondent cases where the public school LMS survey respondent reported possession of state certification, but the LMC survey count was zero. There is no procedure for handling this situation (only in-scopes are imputed)<sup>25</sup>.

There were 18 in-scope cases where the public school LMS survey respondent reported possession of state certification, but the LMC survey count was zero.

For four of the 18, the SASS survey reported more than one librarian. According to the specification, imputation occurred only if the SASS survey reports exactly one librarian, full or part time. Thus, while the SASS survey had more than one librarian and the LMS survey had a librarian reporting state certification, the LMC survey had zero for the number of state-certified specialists.

---

<sup>23</sup>*Item 1a Part 4 in the Library Survey Memorandum 94-7*

<sup>24</sup>*That is, there must be either one full-time and no part-time specialists/librarians, or no full-time and one part-time specialist/librarian.*

<sup>25</sup>*The weights for nonrespondents were redistributed to the in-scopes. The data were blanked.*

For nine of the 18 in-scope schools, either the SASS survey part-time specialist/librarian count was a one and the full-time count was a zero, or the other way around. This met the specification criteria for the SASS survey for imputation. The LMS survey state certification “yes” response, however, was imputed to the LMC survey state-certified specialist count only if the LMC survey had a nonresponse. Imputation did not occur if the count of state-certified specialists was zero as was the case for these nine schools.

For five of the 18 in-scope cases, both the SASS survey part-time and full-time specialist/librarian counts were zero. This situation did not meet the criteria for imputation. The assumption appears to be that if the SASS survey did not report a librarian, then there was no librarian. A librarian did, however, report on the LMS survey.

It seems reasonable that the “yes” response on the LMS survey should be imputed to the LMC survey. The LMS survey was completed by individuals reporting about their selves. The LMC survey could be completed by a librarian or another school staff member. If the LMS survey respondent reported state certification, this was probably more reliable than the LMC survey response.

### **Section 3.0C LMC and LMS Surveys (Public, Private and BIA): Librarian Professional Counts**

#### **Comparison**

The in-scope LMC survey cases were compared to the in-scope LMS survey cases for the number of professionals by each type of school.

#### **Hypothesis**

The count of professionals<sup>26</sup> working in the library for the LMS survey should be equaled or exceeded by the count for the LMC survey. This was because the LMS survey covers only the respondent.

#### *A Reverse Look*

#### **Hypothesis**

If there was one or more professionals reported on the LMC survey for a school, then there should be a completed LMS survey with an affirmative response for degrees.

**Principal Finding:** The reporting for professionals was fairly consistent between the surveys.

#### **Tables**

Tables 3-4 through 3-6 show the data comparison results.

#### **Items**

See Section 3.0A for LMS Items 12, 13a, 14a and 14b, and LMC Items 1a and 1b.

#### **Results in a Nutshell**

The results were inconclusive. The levels of agreement and disagreement were not high enough to declare clear results. Input from data users would be needed to establish criteria for results.

---

<sup>26</sup>*The LMC survey implied that a professional may have an associate, bachelor’s, master’s or doctoral degree. The possession of any of these degrees will be considered professional for these comparisons. Note, however, that the American Association of School Librarians and the Association of Educational Communications and Technology consider the master’s degree in library and information science and related fields to be the entry-level degree for a professional school librarian.*

## Basic Findings

### Public School Findings

Table 3-4 contains all of the basic findings. The following table describes the LMS schools in Table 3-4.

The LMS Survey Public Schools				
Scope	Presence of a Professional Librarian			
	yes	no	no response <sup>27</sup>	Total
in-scope	1,803	142	0	1,945
nonrespondent	0	0	272	272
Total	1,803	142	272	2,217

The following points can be deduced from Table 3-4. Note that each total relates to the total line above.

- Of the 1,803 respondents with a degree, 1,714 (95.1 percent) of their schools reported one or more persons in the library with a degree on the LMC survey, 19 (1.1 percent) reported no degrees, and 70 (3.9 percent) had no response.
- Of the 142 LMS respondents reporting no degree, 34 (23.9 percent) of their schools reported no degrees for the library on the LMC survey, 97 (68.3 percent) reported at least one, and 11 (7.7 percent) had no response.
- Of the 272 LMS forms with no response, 135 (49.6 percent) of these schools reported one or more degrees for the library on the LMC survey, 12 (4.4 percent) reported no degrees, and 125 (46.0 percent) had no response.

Out-of-scope schools are not listed on Table 3-4. There were 371 public schools that were out-of-scope on both surveys. There also were 480 public schools that were out-of-scope on the LMS survey but in-scope on the LMC survey. Of these, 149 had zeros for the number of professionals, 123 had no response, and 208 schools reported one or more professionals.

### A Reverse Look

---

<sup>27</sup>These data were blanked for nonrespondents.

For the 1,946 (87.8 percent) public schools that reported at least one degree on the LMC survey, 1,714 (88.1 percent of the 1,946) LMS respondents reported a degree, 97 (5.0 percent) reported no professional training, and 135 (6.9 percent) had no response.

### Private School Findings

Table 3-5 contains all of the basic findings. The following table describes the LMS schools in Table 3-5.

The LMS Survey Private Schools				
Scope	Presence of a Professional Librarian			
	yes	no	no response <sup>27</sup>	Total
in-scope	813	140	0	953
nonrespondent	0	0	218	218
Total	813	140	218	1,171

The following points can be deduced from Table 3-5. Note that each total relates to the total line above.

- Of the 813 respondents with a degree, 752 (69.4 percent) of their schools reported one or more persons in the library with a degree on the LMC survey, 19 (2.3 percent) reported no degrees, and 42 (5.2 percent) had no response.
- Of the 140 LMS respondents reporting no degree, 21 (15.0 percent) of their schools reported no degrees for the library on the LMC survey, 100 (71.4 percent) reported at least one, and 19 (13.6 percent) had no response.
- Of the 218 LMS forms with no response, 67 (30.7 percent) of these schools reported one or more degrees for the library on the LMC survey, 27 (12.4 percent) reported no degrees, and 124 (56.9 percent) had no response.

Out-of-scope schools are not listed on Table 3-5. There were 465 private schools that were out-of-scope on both surveys. There also were 712 private schools that were out-of-scope on the LMS survey but in-scope on the LMC survey. Of these, 232 had zeros for the number of professionals, 264 were nonrespondents, and 216 schools reported one or more professionals.

### A Reverse Look

For the 919 (78.5 percent) private schools that reported at least one professional on the LMC survey, 752 (81.8 percent of the 919) LMS respondents reported a degree, 100 (10.9 percent) reported no degree, and 67 (7.3 percent) had no response.

### BIA School Findings

Table 3-6 contains all of the basic findings. The following table describes the LMS schools in Table 3-6.

The LMS Survey BIA Schools				
Scope	Presence of a Professional Librarian			Total
	yes	no	no response <sup>28</sup>	
in-scope	77	5	0	82
nonrespondent	0	0	13	13
Total	77	5	13	95

The following points can be deduced from Table 3-6. Note that each total relates to the total line above.

- Of the 77 respondents with a degree, 73 (94.8 percent) of their schools reported one or more persons in the library with a degree on the LMC survey, one (1.3 percent) reported no degrees, and three (3.9 percent) had no response.
- Of the five LMS respondents reporting no degree, two (40.0 percent) of their schools reported no degrees for the library on the LMC survey, and three (60.0 percent) reported at least one.
- Of the 13 LMS forms with no response, seven (53.8 percent) of these schools reported one or more degrees for the library on the LMC survey, two (15.4 percent) reported no degrees, and four (30.8 percent) had no response.

Out-of-scope schools are not listed on Table 3-6. There were 18 BIA schools that were out-of-scope on both surveys. There also were 31 BIA schools that were out-of-scope on the LMS survey but in-scope on the LMC

survey. Of these, 10 had zeros for the number of professionals, eight were nonrespondents, and 13 schools reported one or more professionals.

### A Reverse Look

For the 83 (87.4 percent) BIA schools reporting at least one degree on the LMC survey, 73 (88.0 percent of the 83) LMS respondents reported a degree, three (3.6 percent) reported no degree, and seven (8.4 percent) had no response.

### Intersurvey Agreement and Disagreement

#### Intersurvey Agreement

Considering a nonrespondent status on the LMS and LMC surveys to be equivalent to a response of “no,” the percentage of survey responses that agreed was 85.5 percent for the public schools, 80.5 percent for the private schools, and 85.3 percent for the BIA schools. Discounting the nonrespondents, however, 78.8 percent of the public schools, 66.0 percent of the private schools, and 78.9 percent of the BIA schools had matching responses.

For public schools with professionals heading the library according to the LMS survey, 95.1 percent of the LMC survey respondents reported the librarian was a professional. For private and BIA schools, the ratio was 92.5 and 94.8 percent, respectively.

#### Intersurvey Disagreement

The percentage of survey responses that clearly contradicted each other (“yes” versus “no”) was 5.3 percent for the public schools, 10.2 percent for the private schools, and 4.2 percent for the BIA schools.

There were 142 public, 140 private and five BIA in-scope schools without a professional (“no” for degrees) completing the LMS form. Of these, 97 (68.3 percent of the 142) of the public, 100 (71.4 percent of the 140) of the private, and three (60.0 percent of the five) of the BIA LMC survey respondents thought the librarian was a professional when this was not the case.

For the 19 public schools, 19 private schools and one BIA school where the LMS survey respondent had a degree while the LMC survey reported no professionals, an additional comparison was performed. The data were examined to see if the LMS survey

<sup>28</sup>These data were blanked for nonrespondents.

respondent in these cases was an aide with a degree. There were no such cases.

For the 97 public, 100 private and three BIA schools where the LMS respondent did not have a degree but the LMC survey reported at least one professional, an additional data comparison was done. The data were reviewed for the possibility that an aide without a degree and heading the library was reported on the LMC survey as a professional. There were 35 public, four private and three BIA cases where the LMS survey respondent was an aide without a degree. If the LMS survey was completed by the respondent, then these schools reported staff members without degrees as professionals on the LMC survey.

### **Other Findings**

#### Nonrespondents

The number of cases where the LMC survey indicated at least one professional, but the LMS survey was a nonrespondent, was notable: 6.1 percent for the 2,217 public schools, 5.7 percent for the 1,171 private schools, and 7.4 percent for the 95 BIA schools. The percentage of cases where the LMS survey respondent had a degree but the LMC survey was a nonrespondent was 3.2 for the public schools, 3.6 for the private schools, and 3.2 for the BIA schools.

#### Imputation

An imputation<sup>29</sup> procedure attempted to replace nonresponses for the LMC survey counts of librarians and other professionals. It first tried to impute a “yes” or “no” response from the LMS survey item, “Are you

certified as a library media specialist by this state?,” to the LMC survey counts of librarians and other professionals. A “yes” response was imputed as a count of one for librarians. A “no” response was imputed as a count of one for other professionals.

If the LMS survey item was blank, the imputation procedure looked within the LMC survey. The count of the LMC survey reported degrees was imputed for the LMC survey counts of other professionals.

Then, the imputation returned to the LMS survey to try to replace nonresponses for the LMC survey item asking about degrees. The LMS survey reported degrees were used to impute for nonresponse to the LMC survey item for degrees.

It was possible for the LMS survey respondent to report a degree, but the LMC survey to report no professionals. This situation occurred because the imputation logic sequence was:

1. LMC degrees to LMC other professionals.
2. LMS degrees to LMC degrees.

when it should be:

1. LMS degrees to LMC degrees.
2. LMC degrees to LMC other professionals.

The current imputation procedure allowed that a report of no degrees for the LMC survey resulted in a nonresponse replaced by a zero for other professionals. A degree from the LMS survey then imputed to the LMC survey did not affect the count of professionals. By imputing the degrees from the LMS survey to the LMC survey first, any LMS survey degree then accounted for on the LMC survey would impute to the LMC survey “other professionals” count.

---

<sup>29</sup>*Library Survey Memorandum 94-7*

**Table 3-1. State-Certified Library Media Specialists Counts for Public Schools:  
The Library Media Center Survey Compared to the Library Media Specialist Survey  
for In-Scope Linked Schools, 1993-94**

<b>LMC Survey: Response to Number of State-Certified Specialists</b>	<b>LMS Survey: “Are you certified as a library media specialist by this state?”</b>	<b>Count of LMS Survey Respondents</b>	<b>Percent of Total Responses</b>
At least one	Yes	1,550	69.9
None	Yes	18	0.8
Nonrespondent	Yes	59	2.7
At least one	Nonrespondent	128	5.8
None	Nonrespondent	19	0.9
Nonrespondent	Nonrespondent	125	5.6
At least one	No	75	3.4
None	No	221	10.0
Nonrespondent	No	22	1.0
<b>Total Schools</b>		<b>2,217</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Abbreviations:

LMC = Library Media Center Survey

LMS = Library Media Specialist/Librarian Survey

Notes:

In-scope = The school reported a library (LMC survey) or librarian (LMS survey) and sufficiently completed the survey. Responses and counts are from in-scope schools.

Nonrespondent = Either a nonresponse or insufficient response: the school has a library (LMC survey) or librarian (LMS survey) but the remainder of the survey responses are insufficient for inclusion in the tabulated data.

Linked = Linked schools are those matching by identification number between surveys. The schools are on both surveys' mailing lists, that is, sample.

Source: 1993–94 Library Media Center Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

1993–94 Library Media Specialist/Librarian Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

**Table 3-2. State-Certified Library Media Specialists Counts for Private Schools:  
The Library Media Center Survey Compared to the Library Media Specialist Survey  
for In-Scope Linked Schools, 1993-94**

<b>LMC Survey: Response to Number of State-Certified Specialists</b>	<b>LMS Survey: "Are you certified as a library media specialist by this state?"</b>	<b>Count of LMS Survey Respondents</b>	<b>Percent of Total Responses</b>
At least one	Yes	342	29.2
None	Yes	9	0.8
Nonrespondent	Yes	15	1.3
At least one	Nonrespondent	23	2.0
None	Nonrespondent	71	6.1
Nonrespondent	Nonrespondent	124	10.6
At least one	No	104	8.9
None	No	437	37.3
Nonrespondent	No	46	3.9
<b>Total Schools</b>		<b>1,171</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Abbreviations:

LMC = Library Media Center Survey

LMS = Library Media Specialist/Librarian Survey

Notes:

In-scope = The school reported a library (LMC survey) or librarian (LMS survey) and sufficiently completed the survey. Responses and counts are from in-scope schools.

Nonrespondent = Either a nonresponse or insufficient response: the school has a library (LMC survey) or librarian (LMS survey) but the remainder of the survey responses are insufficient for inclusion in the tabulated data.

Linked = Linked schools are those matching by identification number between surveys. The schools are on both surveys' mailing lists, that is, sample.

Source: 1993-94 Library Media Center Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

1993-94 Library Media Specialist/Librarian Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

**Table 3-3. State-Certified Library Media Specialists Counts for Bureau of Indian Affairs Schools:  
The Library Media Center Survey Compared to the Library Media Specialist Survey  
for In-Scope Linked Schools, 1993-94**

<b>LMC Survey: Response to Number of State-Certified Specialists</b>	<b>LMS Survey: "Are you certified as a library media specialist by this state?"</b>	<b>Count of LMS Survey Respondents</b>	<b>Percent of Total Responses</b>
At least one	Yes	57	60.0
None	Yes	1	1.1
Nonrespondent	Yes	3	3.2
At least one	Nonrespondent	5	5.3
None	Nonrespondent	4	4.2
Nonrespondent	Nonrespondent	4	4.2
At least one	No	7	7.4
None	No	14	14.7
Nonrespondent	No	0	0.0
<b>Total Schools</b>		<b>95</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Abbreviations:

LMC = Library Media Center Survey

LMS = Library Media Specialist/Librarian Survey

Notes:

In-scope = The school reported a library (LMC survey) or librarian (LMS survey) and sufficiently completed the survey. Responses and counts are from in-scope schools.

Nonrespondent = Either a nonresponse or insufficient response: the school has a library (LMC survey) or librarian (LMS survey) but the remainder of the survey responses are insufficient for inclusion in the tabulated data.

Linked = Linked schools are those matching by identification number between surveys. The schools are on both surveys' mailing lists, that is, sample.

Source: 1993-94 Library Media Center Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

1993-94 Library Media Specialist/Librarian Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

**Table 3-4. Professional Staff Counts for Public Schools:  
The Library Media Center Survey Compared to the Library Media Specialist Survey  
for In-Scope Linked Schools, 1993-94**

<b>LMC Survey: Response to Number of Professionals</b>	<b>LMS Survey: Respondent has a degree</b>	<b>Count of LMS Survey Respondents</b>	<b>Percent of Total Responses</b>
At least one	Yes	1,714	77.3
None	Yes	19	0.9
Nonrespondent	Yes	70	3.2
At least one	Nonrespondent	135	6.1
None	Nonrespondent	12	0.5
Nonrespondent	Nonrespondent	125	5.6
At least one	No	97	4.4
None	No	34	1.5
Nonrespondent	No	11	0.5
<b>Total Schools</b>		<b>2,217</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Abbreviations:

LMC = Library Media Center Survey

LMS = Library Media Specialist/Librarian Survey

Notes:

In-scope = The school reported a library (LMC survey) or librarian (LMS survey) and sufficiently completed the survey. The school reported a library (LMC survey) or librarian (LMS survey) and sufficiently completed the survey. Responses and counts are from in-scope schools.

Nonrespondent = Either a nonresponse or insufficient response: the school has a library (LMC survey) or librarian (LMS survey) but the remainder of the survey responses are insufficient for inclusion in the tabulated data.

Linked = Linked schools are those matching by identification number between surveys. The schools are on both surveys' mailing lists, that is, sample.

Source: 1993-94 Library Media Center Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

1993-94 Library Media Specialist/Librarian Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

**Table 3-5. Professional Staff Counts for Private Schools:  
The Library Media Center Survey Compared to the Library Media Specialist Survey  
for In-Scope Linked Schools, 1993-94**

<b>LMC Survey: Response to Number of Professionals</b>	<b>LMS Survey: Respondent has a degree</b>	<b>Count of LMS Survey Respondents</b>	<b>Percent of Total Responses</b>
At least one	Yes	752	64.2
None	Yes	19	1.6
Nonrespondent	Yes	42	3.6
At least one	Nonrespondent	67	5.7
None	Nonrespondent	27	2.3
Nonrespondent	Nonrespondent	124	10.6
At least one	No	100	8.5
None	No	21	1.8
Nonrespondent	No	19	1.6
<b>Total Schools</b>		<b>1,171</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Abbreviations:

LMC = Library Media Center Survey

LMS = Library Media Specialist/Librarian Survey

Notes:

In-scope = The school reported a library (LMC survey) or librarian (LMS survey) and sufficiently completed the survey. The school reported a library (LMC survey) or librarian (LMS survey) and sufficiently completed the survey. Responses and counts are from in-scope schools.

Nonrespondent = Either a nonresponse or insufficient response: the school has a library (LMC survey) or librarian (LMS survey) but the remainder of the survey responses are insufficient for inclusion in the tabulated data.

Linked = Linked schools are those matching by identification number between surveys. The schools are on both surveys' mailing lists, that is, sample.

Source: 1993-94 Library Media Center Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

1993-94 Library Media Specialist/Librarian Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

**Table 3-6. Professional Staff Counts for Bureau of Indian Affairs Schools:  
The Library Media Center Survey Compared to the Library Media Specialist Survey  
for In-Scope Linked Schools, 1993-94**

<b>LMC Survey: Response to Number of Professionals</b>	<b>LMS Survey: Respondent has a degree</b>	<b>Count of LMS Survey Respondents</b>	<b>Percent of Total Responses</b>
At least one	Yes	73	76.8
None	Yes	1	1.1
Nonrespondent	Yes	3	3.2
At least one	Nonrespondent	7	7.4
None	Nonrespondent	2	2.1
Nonrespondent	Nonrespondent	4	4.2
At least one	No	3	3.2
None	No	2	2.1
Nonrespondent	No	0	0.0
<b>Total Schools</b>		<b>95</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Abbreviations:

LMC = Library Media Center Survey

LMS = Library Media Specialist/Librarian Survey

Notes:

In-scope = The school reported a library (LMC survey) or librarian (LMS survey) and sufficiently completed the survey. The school reported a library (LMC survey) or librarian (LMS survey) and sufficiently completed the survey. Responses and counts are from in-scope schools.

Nonrespondent = Either a nonresponse or insufficient response: the school has a library (LMC survey) or librarian (LMS survey) but the remainder of the survey responses are insufficient for inclusion in the tabulated data.

Linked = Linked schools are those matching by identification number between surveys. The schools are on both surveys' mailing lists, that is, sample.

Source: 1993-94 Library Media Center Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

1993-94 Library Media Specialist/Librarian Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

## *Library Media Center Surveys Compared to Other Surveys*

### **Section 3.1A LMC and SASS Surveys (Public, Private and BIA): Librarian and Aide Full-Time and Part-Time Definitions**

#### **Definitions and Items**

##### *LMC*

LMC Item 1a = “How many state-certified library media specialists work in this school’s library media center?” Separate counts are collected for part-time and full-time staff.”

LMC Item 1b = “How many professional staff members working in this school’s library media center are NOT certified as library media specialists?” Separate counts are collected for part-time and full-time staff.”

LMC Item 1c = “How many other PAID employees work in this school’s library media center? Include paid clerical staff, library aides, etc.”

##### *SASS*

SASS Item 16e = “Part-time positions - Library media specialists/librarians”

SASS Item 17e = “Full-time positions - Library media specialists/librarians”

SASS Item 16h = “Part-time positions - Library media center aides”

SASS Item 17h = “Full-time positions - Library media center aides”

#### “INCLUDE AS PART-TIME:

- Employees who work part-time.
- Employees you share with other schools. For the public school survey only: ‘...within or outside of the school district.’

- Employees who perform more than one function at this school; for example, a teaching principal would be counted once as a part-time teacher and again as a part-time principal.”

#### **Discussion**

Differences in counts were expected to due to the handling of volunteers and certain part-time employees. The SASS survey did not mention volunteers or specify that staff positions must be paid. The SASS survey included specific instructions for handling certain part-time employment situations the LMC survey did not address.

The LMC survey did not have reporting instructions for the situations described by the second and third points of the SASS part-time instructions. It was not clear if hours were based on position or actual work assignment. For example, it was not clear if a full-time library media specialist who worked part time elsewhere in the school or at another school would be reported as full time or part time. For the public school LMC survey, it was not explained if an employee based at another school but working part time in the library at the surveyed school should be reported.

The findings showed that more part-time librarians and aides were reported on the LMC survey than the SASS survey. The SASS survey presented specific instructions for handling part-time librarians and aides. It explained how to report employees assigned to more than one school or function. The LMC survey did not. Perhaps the LMC survey respondents were over-reporting the part-time staff due to a lack of instructions.

Fewer full-time aides were reported on the LMC survey than the SASS survey for all types of schools. There were specific instructions on the SASS survey on how to report employees who were assigned to more than one school or function. The LMC survey did not have instructions for these situations; these aides may be omitted from the LMC survey counts.

The low number of part-time aides for private schools on the LMC survey compared to the SASS survey was partly due to the handling of volunteers. The SASS survey did not mention volunteers or specify that staff positions must be paid. The LMC survey specifically stated that employees must be paid and to exclude volunteers. Private schools often have volunteers working in the libraries. Table 3-20, discussed in

Section 3.4B, show that 5.7 percent of the part-time librarians reported on the SASS survey were volunteers for schools linked to the LMS survey.

Note the LMC survey/SASS survey estimates for specialists/librarians were in high agreement, while the LMC survey/CCD survey comparisons in Section 3.3B differed. The SASS terminology, with no definition, provides more consistent results with the LMC survey than the CCD state nonfiscal survey definition.

### Related Report Sections

See Sections 3.1B and 3.1C.

### Section 3.1B LMC and SASS Survey (Public, Private and BIA): Librarian and Aide Full-Time and Part-Time Counts

#### Comparison

The LMC survey was compared to the SASS survey for total counts of library personnel by school.

#### Hypothesis

The lack of instructions for reporting counts of staff assigned to more than one function or school will cause the LMC survey counts to be higher than the SASS survey counts.

**Principal Findings:** The surveys differed on counts of total staff.

#### Tables

Tables 3-7 through 3-8 show data comparisons for in-scope schools in both the LMC survey and the SASS survey samples (in-scope linked schools).

#### Items

See Section 3.1A.

#### Results in a Nutshell

The LMC survey counts of librarians and other professionals were higher than the SASS survey counts as hypothesized. The comparison for the library aides generated mixed results. Note the same results were found for the same comparison of weighted data in Section 3.1C.

## Intersurvey Agreement and Disagreement

### Intersurvey Agreement

The ratios of the LMC survey counts to the SASS survey counts looked reasonable. The LMC survey counts for the full-time and part-time specialists/librarians were higher than the SASS survey counts as expected. The LMC survey counts for the part-time library aides were the same as or higher than the SASS survey counts.

The ratios were mostly consistent across types of schools. For example, the full-time library media specialist/librarian ratios ranged from 102 percent to 111 percent: 102 percent for BIA schools, 105 percent for private schools, and 111 percent for public schools.

### Intersurvey Disagreement

The only surprise in the ratios involved library aides. The full-time library aides counts for all types of schools and the part-time library aides for private schools were notably lower on the LMC survey than those for the SASS survey. This was the opposite of expectations.

## Other Findings

### Imputation

The imputation<sup>30</sup> for the SASS survey public school full-time librarians was examined. (The imputation for the part-time librarians and the full-time and part-time aides was similar.) The imputation replaced a nonresponse. The imputation for full-time librarians had five steps:

1. If the school's local education agency reported no full-time librarians on the TDS survey, then a nonresponse was changed to zero.
2. If step 1 did not apply and if the school's LMS survey indicated there was no librarian, then a zero was imputed.
3. If neither step 1 or step 2 applied, the reported number of full-time librarians from the LMC survey was imputed.

---

<sup>30</sup>SASS Specifications Memorandum 94-32

4 and 5. Steps 4 and 5 used information from other items on the SASS survey for imputation if none of steps 1, 2 or 3 applied.

The TDS local education agency data had precedence over the LMS and LMC survey data for imputation. The data were examined for cases where the local education agency reported no librarians, but the LMC survey or the SASS survey reported one or more. There were 491 such cases. This casts doubt on the validity of this order of precedence. This may help explain why the LMC survey public school counts were higher than the SASS survey counts.

It also was curious that a report of one librarian on the LMS survey was not allowed to impute for Step 2. In Step 3, a report of more than one librarian on the LMC survey could impute over the one, while a “no” response or zero on the LMC survey would not be allowed to impute over.

### **Section 3.1C LMC and SASS Surveys (Public and BIA): Librarian and Aide Full-Time and Part-Time Estimates**

#### **Comparison:**

Estimates for full-time and part-time specialists/librarians and aides by state and by type of school for the LMC survey and the SASS survey samples were compared.

#### **Hypothesis**

The lack of instructions for reporting counts of staff assigned to more than one function or school will cause the LMC estimates to be higher than the SASS survey estimates.

**Principal Findings:** The surveys differed on counts of total staff.

#### **Tables**

Tables 3-9 through 3-16 show the results.

#### **Items**

See Section 3.1A.

#### **Results in a Nutshell**

The LMC survey estimates for librarians and other professionals were higher than the SASS survey estimates as hypothesized. The comparison for library aides generated mixed results. The overall results were the same for the counts in Section 3.1B.

#### **Basic Findings**

Results for library aide data were mixed. Part-time aide estimates were higher on the LMC survey as expected. The number of full-time aides on the LMC survey compared to the SASS survey was low for both types of schools.

#### **Public School Findings**

For public schools, the LMC survey estimates for librarians/specialists and part-time aides were higher than the SASS survey estimates at the national level, as expected. The ratio for full-time aides, however, was low.

The data for full-time specialists/librarians showed high agreement between the LMC survey and the SASS survey. Most states reported slightly higher on the SASS survey as expected. The ratios ranged from 0.92 to 1.59 with a national average of 1.11.

The data for part-time specialists/librarians showed a wider range of ratios, but most states reported as expected. The ratios ranged from 0.67 to 3.77 with a national average of 1.29.

The data for full-time library aides showed the opposite of expectations. The ratios ranged from 0.37 to 2.33 with a national average of 0.83.

The data for part-time library aides showed expected results. The ratios ranged from 0.43 to 4.04 with a national average of 1.14.

#### **BIA School Findings**

For the BIA schools, the ratio of librarians/specialists in the LMC survey to the SASS survey was 1.14 for full time and 1.67 for part time, in line with expectations. The ratio of full-time aides was low, 0.83, and the ratio for part-time aides is 1.49, as expected. These ratios followed the same pattern as the ratios for the public schools.

#### **Other Findings**

## Public School Estimation

Georgia's ratio of 3.77 on Table 3-10 was high relative to the other states. Seven Georgia schools on the LMC

survey and six on the SASS survey reported a part-time library media specialist/librarian. Weighted, these estimates were 231.3 and 61.3.

Few Georgia schools reported consistently. Five of the schools that reported one on the LMC survey reported zero on the SASS survey. Two of the schools reporting one on the SASS survey reported none on the LMC survey.

Thus, the high ratio for Georgia was due to high variance and inconsistent reporting by individual schools between surveys. With so few responses, each response had a great impact.

**Table 3-7. Part-Time and Full-Time Library Media Specialist/Librarian Counts by Type of School:  
The Library Media Center Survey Compared to the Schools and Staffing Survey  
for In-Scope Linked Schools, 1993-94**

<b>Type of School</b>	<b>LMC Survey Count</b>	<b>SASS Survey Count</b>	<b>Ratio: LMC/SASS</b>
	<b>(C1)</b>	<b>(C2)</b>	<b>(C1/C2)</b>
<b>Part time</b>			
Public	1,309	1,050	1.25
Private	938	741	1.27
BIA	47	31	1.52
<b>Full time</b>			
Public	3,887	3,497	1.11
Private	1,066	1,013	1.05
BIA	95	93	1.02

Abbreviations:

LMC = Library Media Center Survey

SASS = Schools and Staffing Survey

Notes:

For this table, library media specialists/librarians are defined as:

For the LMC survey = library media specialists/librarians and other professionals working in the library.

For the SASS survey = library media specialists/librarians.

In-scope = For the LMS survey, the school reported a library and sufficiently completed the form. For the SASS survey, the school is in operation and is an elementary or secondary school.

Nonrespondent = For the LMS survey, the school either is a nonrespondent, or has a library but the remainder of the survey responses are insufficient for inclusion in the tabulated data. For the SASS survey, the school meets the in-scope criteria but is either a nonrespondent or the remainder of the survey responses are insufficient for inclusion in the tabulated data.

Linked = Linked schools are those matching by identification number between surveys. The schools are on both surveys' mailing lists, that is, sample.

Source: 1993-94 Library Media Center Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

1993-94 Schools and Staffing Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

**Table 3-8. Part-Time and Full-Time Library Media Center Aides Counts by Type of School:  
The Library Media Center Survey Compared to the Schools and Staffing Survey  
for In-Scope Linked Schools, 1993-94**

<b>Type of School</b>	<b>LMC Survey Count</b>	<b>SASS Survey Count</b>	<b>Ratio: LMC/SASS</b>
	<b>(C1)</b>	<b>(C2)</b>	<b>(C1/C2)</b>
<b>Part time</b>			
Public	1,479	1,118	1.32
Private	579	594	.98
BIA	30	22	1.36
<b>Full time</b>			
Public	1,797	2,113	.85
Private	235	267	.88
BIA	39	53	.74

Abbreviations:

BIA = Bureau of Indian Affairs  
 LMC = Library Media Center Survey  
 SASS = Schools and Staffing Survey

Notes:

For this table, library media center aides are defined as:

For the LMC survey = library aides and clerks working in the library.

For the SASS survey = library aides.

In-scope = For the LMS survey, the school reported a library and sufficiently completed the form. For the SASS survey, the school is in operation and is an elementary or secondary school.

Nonrespondent = For the LMS survey, the school either is a nonrespondent, or has a library but the remainder of the survey responses are insufficient for inclusion in the tabulated data. For the SASS survey, the school meets the in-scope criteria but is either a nonrespondent or the remainder of the survey responses are insufficient for inclusion in the tabulated data.

Linked = Linked schools are those matching by identification number between surveys. The schools are on both surveys' mailing lists, that is, sample.

Source: 1993-94 Library Media Center Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

1993-94 Schools and Staffing Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

**Table 3-9. Full-Time Library Media Specialist/Librarian Estimates for Public Schools:  
The Library Media Center Survey Compared to the Schools and Staffing Survey  
by State, 1993-94**

By Alphabetical State Order				By Descending LMC/SASS Ratio	
LMC Survey (C1)	SASS Survey (C2)	LMC/SASS (C1/C2)		LMC/SASS (C1/C2)	
United States	57,606.4	52,032.1	1.11	United States	1.11
Alabama	1,315.5	1,199.7	1.10	South Dakota	1.59
Alaska	203.2	187.1	1.09	Kansas	1.46
Arizona	1,058.6	834.5	1.27	Idaho	1.42
Arkansas	969.0	951.1	1.02	Oklahoma	1.39
California	2,777.5	2,494.9	1.11	Maine	1.38
Colorado	915.8	928.5	0.99	North Dakota	1.38
Connecticut	552.9	599.2	0.92	Montana	1.35
Delaware	141.3	140.6	1.00	Missouri	1.34
District of Columbia	166.2	157.4	1.06	Oregon	1.34
Florida	2,640.5	2,512.4	1.05	Arizona	1.27
Georgia	2,129.1	1,917.0	1.11	New Hampshire	1.25
Hawaii	251.5	259.3	0.97	Wyoming	1.25
Idaho	340.3	238.9	1.42	Illinois	1.25
Illinois	2,600.1	2,081.2	1.25	Indiana	1.23
Indiana	1,465.3	1,195.8	1.23	Iowa	1.22
Iowa	727.2	596.3	1.22	Nebraska	1.21
Kansas	985.1	674.1	1.46	New Mexico	1.20
Kentucky	1,247.5	1,097.8	1.14	Massachusetts	1.16
Louisiana	1,206.3	1,146.0	1.05	Pennsylvania	1.15
Maine	334.8	242.4	1.38	Mississippi	1.14
Maryland	1,092.2	1,026.8	1.06	Kentucky	1.14
Massachusetts	924.0	799.3	1.16	California	1.11
Michigan	1,879.4	1,724.3	1.09	Georgia	1.11
Minnesota	815.6	831.3	0.98	Wisconsin	1.10
Mississippi	894.7	782.8	1.14	North Carolina	1.10
Missouri	1,495.2	1,113.3	1.34	Alabama	1.10
Montana	367.5	273.1	1.35	Michigan	1.09
Nebraska	546.6	453.1	1.21	South Carolina	1.09
Nevada	337.6	311.2	1.08	Alaska	1.09
New Hampshire	263.7	210.3	1.25	Nevada	1.08
New Jersey	1,490.0	1,549.2	0.96	Tennessee	1.08
New Mexico	460.3	383.1	1.20	Texas	1.07
New York	2,881.1	2,978.2	0.97	Utah	1.06
North Carolina	2,145.3	1,951.3	1.10	Maryland	1.06
North Dakota	149.8	108.9	1.38	District of Columbia	1.06
Ohio	2,174.0	2,093.1	1.04	Louisiana	1.05
Oklahoma	1,246.9	897.7	1.39	Florida	1.05
Oregon	700.9	523.6	1.34	Ohio	1.04
Pennsylvania	2,273.7	1,981.3	1.15	Virginia	1.04
Rhode Island	147.0	144.3	1.02	Arkansas	1.02
South Carolina	1,185.4	1,091.1	1.09	Rhode Island	1.02
South Dakota	295.7	186.4	1.59	Vermont	1.01
Tennessee	1,421.0	1,312.0	1.08	Washington	1.01
Texas	4,738.9	4,442.2	1.07	Delaware	1.00
Utah	391.6	367.8	1.06	Colorado	0.99
Vermont	185.7	183.4	1.01	Minnesota	0.98
Virginia	1,754.4	1,691.1	1.04	Hawaii	0.97
Washington	1,290.9	1,280.8	1.01	New York	0.97
West Virginia	376.8	404.4	0.93	New Jersey	0.96
Wisconsin	1,463.7	1,331.2	1.10	West Virginia	0.93
Wyoming	189.4	151.5	1.25	Connecticut	0.92

Abbreviations: LMC = Library Media Center SASS = Schools and Staffing Survey

Notes:

For this table, library media specialists/ librarians are defined as: For the LMC survey = library media specialists/ librarians and other professionals working in the library. For the SASS survey = library media specialists/ librarians.

Source:

1993-94 Library Media Center Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)  
1993-94 Schools and Staffing Survey data file (U. S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

**Table 3-10. Part-Time Library Media Specialist/Librarian Estimates for Public Schools:  
The Library Media Center Survey Compared to the Schools and Staffing Survey  
by State, 1993-94**

By Alphabetical State Order				By Descending LMC/SASS Ratio	
LMC Survey	SASS Survey	LMC/SASS	LMC/SASS		
(C1)	(C2)	(C1/C2)	(C1/C2)		
United States	29,897.6	23,093.3	1.29	United States	1.29
Alabama	51.8	77.6	0.67	Georgia	3.77
Alaska	229.6	127.9	1.80	Hawaii	2.38
Arizona	150.4	165.8	0.91	Nevada	2.32
Arkansas	287.0	182.8	1.57	Michigan	2.29
California	4,152.2	2,318.3	1.79	Virginia	2.13
Colorado	536.5	311.0	1.73	Mississippi	1.88
Connecticut	219.2	219.1	1.00	South Carolina	1.83
Delaware	26.3	36.8	0.71	Alaska	1.80
District of Columbia	2.7	2.5	1.09	California	1.79
Florida	56.2	52.6	1.07	North Carolina	1.74
Georgia	231.3	61.3	3.77	Colorado	1.73
Hawaii	6.2	2.6	2.38	Arkansas	1.57
Idaho	265.8	219.6	1.21	Vermont	1.57
Illinois	1,780.4	1,223.2	1.46	Oregon	1.46
Indiana	518.9	603.9	0.86	Illinois	1.46
Iowa	1,161.4	887.1	1.31	Minnesota	1.42
Kansas	887.9	809.5	1.10	Utah	1.41
Kentucky	379.2	361.9	1.05	Wyoming	1.39
Louisiana	298.0	258.4	1.15	Montana	1.38
Maine	259.1	213.5	1.21	New York	1.35
Maryland	249.8	284.0	0.88	New Jersey	1.34
Massachusetts	557.2	570.2	0.98	Iowa	1.31
Michigan	1,468.9	641.1	2.29	Ohio	1.30
Minnesota	950.9	671.1	1.42	Nebraska	1.25
Mississippi	127.8	67.9	1.88	South Dakota	1.23
Missouri	1,140.8	1,074.1	1.06	Maine	1.21
Montana	746.9	542.7	1.38	North Dakota	1.21
Nebraska	659.2	527.9	1.25	Idaho	1.21
Nevada	100.1	43.1	2.32	Louisiana	1.15
New Hampshire	151.7	154.2	0.98	Washington	1.12
New Jersey	958.7	717.4	1.34	West Virginia	1.10
New Mexico	106.0	138.4	0.77	Rhode Island	1.10
New York	1,376.1	1,016.2	1.35	Kansas	1.10
North Carolina	453.1	260.6	1.74	District of Columbia	1.09
North Dakota	435.9	359.8	1.21	Florida	1.07
Ohio	1,673.7	1,285.4	1.30	Missouri	1.06
Oklahoma	818.3	772.7	1.06	Oklahoma	1.06
Oregon	589.4	402.5	1.46	Kentucky	1.05
Pennsylvania	1,181.2	1,275.9	0.93	Texas	1.02
Rhode Island	175.2	158.6	1.10	Connecticut	1.00
South Carolina	104.7	57.4	1.83	Wisconsin	0.99
South Dakota	497.3	403.6	1.23	New Hampshire	0.98
Tennessee	205.3	283.5	0.72	Massachusetts	0.98
Texas	1,192.0	1,166.6	1.02	Pennsylvania	0.93
Utah	251.6	178.2	1.41	Arizona	0.91
Vermont	194.8	124.5	1.57	Maryland	0.88
Virginia	219.2	103.1	2.13	Indiana	0.86
Washington	555.1	496.1	1.12	New Mexico	0.77
West Virginia	241.4	218.5	1.10	Tennessee	0.72
Wisconsin	803.2	810.6	0.99	Delaware	0.71
Wyoming	212.0	152.3	1.39	Alabama	0.67

Abbreviations:

LMC = Library Media Center

SASS = Schools and Staffing Survey

Notes:

For this table, library media specialists/ librarians are defined as: For the LMC survey = library media specialists/ librarians and other professionals working in the library. For the SASS survey = library media specialists/ librarians.

Source:

1993-94 Library Media Center Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)  
1993-94 Schools and Staffing Survey data file (U. S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

**Table 3-11. Full-Time Library Aide Estimates for Public Schools:  
The Library Media Center Survey Compared to the Schools and Staffing Survey  
by State, 1993-94**

<b>By Alphabetical State Order</b>				<b>By Descending LMC/SASS Ratio</b>	
	<b>LMC Survey</b>	<b>SASS Survey</b>	<b>LMC/SASS</b>	<b>LMC/SASS</b>	
	<b>(C1)</b>	<b>(C2)</b>	<b>(C1/C2)</b>	<b>(C1/C2)</b>	
United States	26,554.8	31,997.9	0.83	United States	0.83
Alabama	330.5	531.8	0.62	Rhode Island	2.33
Alaska	78.7	76.6	1.03	New Jersey	1.25
Arizona	319.5	540.0	0.59	Louisiana	1.17
Arkansas	121.8	217.2	0.56	Massachusetts	1.14
California	1,743.8	1,943.8	0.90	Virginia	1.12
Colorado	567.9	632.6	0.90	Illinois	1.11
Connecticut	476.2	455.4	1.05	Hawaii	1.08
Delaware	17.3	23.6	0.73	Michigan	1.06
District of Columbia	27.5	39.5	0.70	Connecticut	1.05
Florida	1,260.1	1,411.6	0.89	Minnesota	1.03
Georgia	886.4	1,283.9	0.69	Alaska	1.03
Hawaii	55.6	51.5	1.08	Colorado	0.90
Idaho	100.1	274.0	0.37	California	0.90
Illinois	1,636.5	1,471.3	1.11	New York	0.89
Indiana	887.8	1,101.2	0.81	Florida	0.89
Iowa	464.3	646.8	0.72	Washington	0.88
Kansas	419.9	544.5	0.77	Ohio	0.88
Kentucky	289.9	531.5	0.55	Mississippi	0.87
Louisiana	256.1	219.4	1.17	Tennessee	0.86
Maine	230.9	402.9	0.57	North Dakota	0.85
Maryland	341.9	467.1	0.73	Pennsylvania	0.83
Massachusetts	575.6	506.6	1.14	Indiana	0.81
Michigan	1,166.2	1,100.4	1.06	Texas	0.79
Minnesota	725.8	705.1	1.03	Utah	0.78
Mississippi	403.9	463.0	0.87	Kansas	0.77
Missouri	319.6	555.1	0.58	New Hampshire	0.76
Montana	91.8	167.9	0.55	Oklahoma	0.76
Nebraska	304.8	414.9	0.73	Vermont	0.75
Nevada	70.2	155.9	0.45	Nebraska	0.73
New Hampshire	136.8	180.6	0.76	Oregon	0.73
New Jersey	904.5	722.4	1.25	Maryland	0.73
New Mexico	217.3	326.4	0.67	Delaware	0.73
New York	1,496.0	1,674.9	0.89	Iowa	0.72
North Carolina	538.2	839.1	0.64	District of Columbia	0.70
North Dakota	98.7	115.9	0.85	Wyoming	0.69
Ohio	1,186.6	1,354.4	0.88	Georgia	0.69
Oklahoma	605.2	799.8	0.76	Wisconsin	0.67
Oregon	431.4	587.8	0.73	New Mexico	0.67
Pennsylvania	844.5	1,021.2	0.83	North Carolina	0.64
Rhode Island	59.0	25.3	2.33	South Dakota	0.62
South Carolina	506.4	816.5	0.62	Alabama	0.62
South Dakota	101.0	161.7	0.62	South Carolina	0.62
Tennessee	268.1	311.8	0.86	Arizona	0.59
Texas	2,636.0	3,319.2	0.79	Missouri	0.58
Utah	129.2	166.2	0.78	Maine	0.57
Vermont	90.9	121.5	0.75	Arkansas	0.56
Virginia	792.6	710.1	1.12	Montana	0.55
Washington	556.2	630.4	0.88	Kentucky	0.55
West Virginia	19.2	40.8	0.47	West Virginia	0.47
Wisconsin	652.3	971.3	0.67	Nevada	0.45
Wyoming	114.6	165.4	0.69	Idaho	0.37

Abbreviations: LMC = Library Media Center

SASS = Schools and Staffing Survey

Notes:

For this table, library media center aides are defined as:

For the LMC survey = library aides and clerks working in the library. For the SASS survey = library aides.

Source:

1993-94 Library Media Center Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

1993-94 Schools and Staffing Survey data file (U. S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

**Table 3-12. Part-Time Library Aide Estimates for Public Schools:  
The Library Media Center Survey Compared to the Schools and Staffing Survey  
by State, 1993-94**

<b>By Alphabetical State Order</b>				<b>By Descending LMC/SASS Ratio</b>	
	<b>LMC Survey</b>	<b>SASS Survey</b>	<b>LMC/SASS</b>	<b>LMC/SASS</b>	
	<b>(C1)</b>	<b>(C2)</b>	<b>(C1/C2)</b>	<b>(C1/C2)</b>	
United States	26,557.6	23,271.2	1.14	United States	1.14
Alabama	204.9	194.6	1.05	District of Columbia	4.04
Alaska	179.0	143.0	1.25	Louisiana	2.29
Arizona	503.0	361.1	1.39	Tennessee	2.03
Arkansas	167.6	212.0	0.79	Texas	1.83
California	2,270.1	3,022.1	0.75	Delaware	1.77
Colorado	406.9	556.5	0.73	Virginia	1.72
Connecticut	314.1	215.5	1.46	Florida	1.67
Delaware	42.8	24.2	1.77	Nevada	1.61
District of Columbia	22.6	5.6	4.04	Vermont	1.53
Florida	626.8	374.8	1.67	Nebraska	1.50
Georgia	283.6	409.1	0.69	Maryland	1.47
Hawaii	30.9	22.8	1.36	Connecticut	1.46
Idaho	232.9	233.4	1.00	Illinois	1.45
Illinois	1,748.8	1,205.0	1.45	New York	1.43
Indiana	576.1	497.2	1.16	Arizona	1.39
Iowa	848.0	728.6	1.16	Hawaii	1.36
Kansas	639.6	473.9	1.35	Washington	1.36
Kentucky	429.3	354.7	1.21	Kansas	1.35
Louisiana	171.3	74.8	2.29	Wisconsin	1.33
Maine	198.9	211.7	0.94	North Carolina	1.30
Maryland	386.8	262.7	1.47	Alaska	1.25
Massachusetts	466.0	440.6	1.06	South Carolina	1.25
Michigan	1,290.2	1,121.8	1.15	North Dakota	1.24
Minnesota	953.7	802.5	1.19	Kentucky	1.21
Mississippi	97.7	99.2	0.98	Minnesota	1.19
Missouri	444.4	508.3	0.87	Pennsylvania	1.17
Montana	336.6	316.4	1.06	Iowa	1.16
Nebraska	630.2	421.0	1.50	Indiana	1.16
Nevada	155.1	96.4	1.61	Michigan	1.15
New Hampshire	181.5	161.6	1.12	West Virginia	1.14
New Jersey	804.1	734.8	1.09	Wyoming	1.14
New Mexico	43.7	101.5	0.43	New Hampshire	1.12
New York	1,542.5	1,078.1	1.43	New Jersey	1.09
North Carolina	743.8	570.4	1.30	Montana	1.06
North Dakota	208.7	168.2	1.24	Massachusetts	1.06
Ohio	999.2	1,174.2	0.85	Alabama	1.05
Oklahoma	382.2	531.0	0.72	Idaho	1.00
Oregon	486.8	534.2	0.91	Mississippi	0.98
Pennsylvania	1,110.4	952.2	1.17	Maine	0.94
Rhode Island	99.5	120.2	0.83	Oregon	0.91
South Carolina	292.1	233.5	1.25	Utah	0.90
South Dakota	203.3	234.9	0.87	Missouri	0.87
Tennessee	284.4	140.2	2.03	South Dakota	0.87
Texas	1,421.2	778.7	1.83	Ohio	0.85
Utah	278.8	308.3	0.90	Rhode Island	0.83
Vermont	114.2	74.6	1.53	Arkansas	0.79
Virginia	364.7	212.4	1.72	California	0.75
Washington	1,001.9	739.3	1.36	Colorado	0.73
West Virginia	59.2	51.8	1.14	Oklahoma	0.72
Wisconsin	1,094.7	821.0	1.33	Georgia	0.69
Wyoming	182.8	160.6	1.14	New Mexico	0.43

Abbreviations: LMC = Library Media Center

SASS = Schools and Staffing Survey

Notes:

For this table, library media center aides are defined as:

For the LMC survey = library aides and clerks working in the library. For the SASS survey = library aides.

Source:

1993-94 Library Media Center Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

1993-94 Schools and Staffing Survey data file (U. S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

**Table 3-13. Full-Time Library Media Specialist/Librarian Estimates for Bureau of Indian Affair Schools: The Library Media Center Survey Compared to the Schools and Staffing Survey by State, 1993-94**

<b>By Alphabetical State Order</b>				<b>By Descending LMC/SASS Ratio</b>	
<b>LMC Survey</b>	<b>SASS Survey</b>	<b>LMC/SASS</b>		<b>LMC/SASS</b>	
<b>(C1)</b>	<b>(C2)</b>	<b>(C1/C2)</b>		<b>(C1/C2)</b>	
United States	106.9	94.2	1.14	United States	1.14
Arizona	33.6	30.2	1.11	Washington	1.90
California	1.4	1.0	1.36	North Dakota	1.64
Connecticut	0.0	0.0	0.00	California	1.36
Florida	0.0	0.0	0.00	New Mexico	1.26
Idaho	0.0	0.0	0.00	Michigan	1.23
Iowa	0.0	0.0	0.00	Oregon	1.22
Kansas	1.0	1.0	0.93	Minnesota	1.19
Louisiana	0.0	0.0	0.00	North Carolina	1.13
Michigan	1.3	1.0	1.23	Wisconsin	1.11
Minnesota	3.7	3.1	1.19	Arizona	1.11
Mississippi	1.0	0.0	0.00	Oklahoma	1.04
Montana	0.0	0.0	0.00	Kansas	0.93
Nevada	0.0	0.0	0.00	South Dakota	0.72
New Mexico	27.9	22.2	1.26	Idaho	0.00
North Carolina	2.3	2.0	1.13	Connecticut	0.00
North Dakota	13.1	8.0	1.64	Montana	0.00
Oklahoma	2.1	2.0	1.04	Louisiana	0.00
Oregon	1.2	1.0	1.22	Mississippi	0.00
South Dakota	13.4	18.5	0.72	Utah	0.00
Utah	0.0	1.0	0.00	Wyoming	0.00
Washington	3.8	2.0	1.90	Nevada	0.00
Wisconsin	1.1	1.0	1.11	Florida	0.00
Wyoming	0.0	0.0	0.00	Iowa	0.00

**Abbreviations:**

LMC = Library Media Center

SASS = Schools and Staffing Survey

**Notes:**

For this table, library media specialists/ librarians are defined as:

For the LMC survey = library media specialists/ librarians and other professionals working in the library.

For the SASS survey = library media specialists/ librarians.

**Source:**

1993-94 Library Media Center Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

1993-94 Schools and Staffing Survey data file (U. S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

**Table 3-14. Part-Time Library Media Specialist/Librarian Estimates for Bureau of Indian Affairs Schools: The Library Media Center Survey Compared to the Schools and Staffing Survey by State, 1993-94**

By Alphabetical State Order				By Descending LMC/SASS Ratio	
	LMC Survey	SASS Survey	LMC/SASS	LMC/SASS	
	(C1)	(C2)	(C1/C2)	(C1/C2)	
United States	51.9	31.1	1.67	United States	1.67
Arizona	17.9	9.0	1.98	New Mexico	2.34
California	0.0	0.0	0.00	Montana	2.10
Connecticut	0.0	0.0	0.00	Arizona	1.98
Florida	1.2	1.0	1.18	South Dakota	1.54
Idaho	0.0	0.0	0.00	Florida	??
Iowa	1.1	1.0	1.12	Washington	1.13
Kansas	0.0	0.0	0.00	Iowa	1.12
Louisiana	0.0	0.0	0.00	Wyoming	1.03
Michigan	0.0	0.0	0.00	Mississippi	1.02
Minnesota	0.0	0.0	0.00	North Dakota	0.28
Mississippi	1.0	1.0	1.02	California	0.00
Montana	2.1	1.0	2.10	Idaho	0.00
Nevada	0.0	1.0	0.00	Connecticut	0.00
New Mexico	14.1	6.0	2.34	Minnesota	0.00
North Carolina	2.3	0.0	0.00	Michigan	0.00
North Dakota	1.1	4.0	0.28	North Carolina	0.00
Oklahoma	0.0	0.0	0.00	Louisiana	0.00
Oregon	0.0	0.0	0.00	Wisconsin	0.00
South Dakota	7.8	5.1	1.54	Oklahoma	0.00
Utah	0.0	0.0	0.00	Nevada	0.00
Washington	1.1	1.0	1.13	Kansas	0.00
Wisconsin	1.1	0.0	0.00	Oregon	0.00
Wyoming	1.1	1.0	1.03	Utah	0.00

Abbreviations:

LMC = Library Media Center  
 SASS = Schools and Staffing Survey

Notes:

For this table, library media specialists/ librarians are defined as:

For the LMC survey = library media specialists/ librarians and other professionals working in the library.  
 For the SASS survey = library media specialists/ librarians.

Source:

1993-94 Library Media Center Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)  
 1993-94 Schools and Staffing Survey data file (U. S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

**Table 3-15. Full-Time Library Aide Estimates for Bureau of Indian Affair Schools:  
The Library Media Center Survey Compared to the Schools and Staffing Survey  
by State, 1993-94**

<b>By Alphabetical State Order</b>				<b>By Descending LMC/SASS Ratio</b>	
<b>LMC Survey</b>	<b>SASS Survey</b>	<b>LMC/SASS</b>		<b>LMC/SASS</b>	
<b>(C1)</b>	<b>(C2)</b>	<b>(C1/C2)</b>		<b>(C1/C2)</b>	
United States	44.1	53.4	0.83	United States	0.83
Arizona	12.1	18.1	0.67	California	1.36
California	1.4	1.0	1.36	Washington	1.34
Connecticut	0.0	0.0	0.00	Minnesota	1.15
Florida	0.0	0.0	0.00	New Mexico	1.04
Idaho	0.0	0.0	0.00	North Dakota	0.83
Iowa	0.0	0.0	0.00	Arizona	0.67
Kansas	0.0	0.0	0.00	South Dakota	0.64
Louisiana	0.0	0.0	0.00	Florida	0.00
Michigan	1.3	0.0	0.00	Montana	0.00
Minnesota	1.2	1.0	1.15	Iowa	0.00
Mississippi	0.0	0.0	0.00	Connecticut	0.00
Montana	0.0	0.0	0.00	Louisiana	0.00
Nevada	0.0	0.0	0.00	Michigan	0.00
New Mexico	14.5	14.0	1.04	North Carolina	0.00
North Carolina	0.0	2.0	0.00	Mississippi	0.00
North Dakota	3.3	4.0	0.83	Wyoming	0.00
Oklahoma	1.1	0.0	0.00	Oregon	0.00
Oregon	0.0	0.0	0.00	Nevada	0.00
South Dakota	6.5	10.2	0.64	Wisconsin	0.00
Utah	0.0	0.0	0.00	Idaho	0.00
Washington	2.7	2.0	1.34	Kansas	0.00
Wisconsin	0.0	1.0	0.00	Oklahoma	0.00
Wyoming	0.0	0.0	0.00	Utah	0.00

Abbreviations:

LMC = Library Media Center

SASS = Schools and Staffing Survey

Notes:

For this table, library media center aides are defined as:

For the LMC survey = library aides and clerks working in the library.

For the SASS survey = library aides.

Source:

1993-94 Library Media Center Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

1993-94 Schools and Staffing Survey data file (U. S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

**Table 3-16. Part-Time Library Aide Estimates for Bureau of Indian Affair Schools:  
The Library Media Center Survey Compared to the Schools and Staffing Survey  
by State, 1993-94**

<b>By Alphabetical State Order</b>				<b>By Descending LMC/SASS Ratio</b>	
	<b>LMC Survey</b>	<b>SASS Survey</b>	<b>LMC/SASS</b>	<b>LMC/SASS</b>	
	<b>(C1)</b>	<b>(C2)</b>	<b>(C1/C2)</b>	<b>(C1/C2)</b>	
United States	32.9	22.0	1.49	United States	1.49
Arizona	10.8	9.0	1.20	New Mexico	2.99
California	0.0	0.0	0.00	South Dakota	1.65
Connecticut	0.0	0.0	0.00	Washington	1.34
Florida	0.0	0.0	0.00	Arizona	1.20
Idaho	0.0	0.0	0.00	North Dakota	0.00
Iowa	0.0	0.0	0.00	North Carolina	0.00
Kansas	0.0	0.0	0.00	Nevada	0.00
Louisiana	0.0	0.0	0.00	Oklahoma	0.00
Michigan	0.0	0.0	0.00	Utah	0.00
Minnesota	0.0	0.0	0.00	Wisconsin	0.00
Mississippi	0.0	0.0	0.00	Oregon	0.00
Montana	0.0	0.0	0.00	Wyoming	0.00
Nevada	1.2	0.0	0.00	Idaho	0.00
New Mexico	12.0	4.0	2.99	Iowa	0.00
North Carolina	0.0	0.0	0.00	Florida	0.00
North Dakota	3.2	4.0	0.00	California	0.00
Oklahoma	0.0	0.0	0.00	Connecticut	0.00
Oregon	0.0	0.0	0.00	Kansas	0.00
South Dakota	3.3	2.0	1.65	Mississippi	0.00
Utah	0.0	1.0	0.00	Montana	0.00
Washington	1.3	1.0	1.34	Minnesota	0.00
Wisconsin	1.1	0.0	0.00	Louisiana	0.00
Wyoming	0.0	1.0	0.00	Michigan	0.00

Abbreviations:

LMC = Library Media Center  
SASS = Schools and Staffing Survey

Notes:

For this table, library media center aides are defined as:  
For the LMC survey = library aides and clerks working in the library.  
For the SASS survey = library aides.

Source:

1993-94 Library Media Center Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)  
1993-94 Schools and Staffing Survey data file (U. S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

### **Section 3.2A LMC and SASS TDS Survey (Public): Librarian Definitions**

#### **Definitions and Items**

##### *LMC*

LMC Item 1a = “How many state-certified library media specialists work in this school’s library media center?”

LMC Item 1b = “How many professional staff members working in this school’s library media center are NOT certified as library media specialists?”

##### *SASS*

SASS Item 19 = “Around October 1 of this school year, how many FTE library media specialists/librarians were employed by this district?”

#### **Discussion**

The TDS survey collected counts of library media specialists/librarians employed by the local education agency. Because the survey collected by assignment, the counts may include other professionals working in the library. The TDS survey state estimates can be compared to the public school LMC survey state estimates for the number of library media specialists and other professionals working in the library. Neither survey presented a definition. Differences may occur because:

- (1) the surveys had different units of collection: the TDS survey collected data in full-time equivalents while the LMC survey collected counts,
- (2) the LMC survey counts specifically included other professionals who work in the library media center, while the TDS survey did not specifically state so, and
- (3) the surveys had different levels of reporting: the TDS survey respondent was at the state level while the LMC survey respondent was at the school level. The TDS survey may have included

specialists/librarians who provide district-level services.

Note that a librarian shared between two schools would be counted on both schools’ LMC surveys, but reported on a FTE basis for the TDS survey.

#### **Related Report Sections**

See Section 3.2B.

### **Section 3.2B LMC and SASS TDS Survey (Public): Librarian Estimates**

#### **Comparison**

The estimates of specialists/librarians on the TDS survey were compared to the estimates of library media specialists plus other professionals working in the library on the public school LMC survey.

#### **Hypothesis**

Differences in the estimates are expected because the surveys 1) have different units of collection, 2) have different levels of reporting, and 3) the LMC survey count includes other professionals while the TDS survey does not.

***Principal Findings:*** The estimates of librarians differed between surveys.

#### **Tables**

Table 3-17 shows the results.

#### **Items**

See Section 3.2A.

#### **Results in a Nutshell**

The LMC survey estimates equaled or exceeded the TDS survey estimates. The difference in units of collection may be the overriding factor. The data, however, may indicate many professionals who are not specialists/librarians are working in the library. The estimation of the LMC survey also may be a factor.

## **Basic Findings**

For the nation, the ratio of all professionals in the library reported on the LMC survey to specialists and librarians reported on the TDS survey was 1.69. In all but one state, the ratio was greater than 1.0; the only exception is 0.9 for Hawaii.

## **Other Findings**

### Estimation

The District of Columbia was notable as an outlier with a ratio of 42.23. The sole local education agency in the District of Columbia reported four specialists/librarians on the SASS survey while the individual schools reported 60, with a weighted aggregate of 168.9. It is likely there was a data error on the part of the local education agency. Removing the District from the national totals has no effect on the national LMC survey/SASS survey ratio.

The reporting for California was interesting. The SASS TDS survey specialists/librarians count was 928 which weights to 1,718. It was reasonable to assume this should represent both specialists/librarians and other professionals working in the library because analysis showed the SASS survey public school count did.

The CCD state nonfiscal survey collected counts of specialists/librarians separately from the other professionals. The CCD state nonfiscal survey reported 928 specialists/librarians and 3,022 other professionals. This totaled to 3,950 specialists/librarians and other professionals.

The public school SASS survey count for California was 4,813.2 specialists/librarians and other professionals. This was reasonably close to the CCD state nonfiscal survey total of 3,950.

The conclusion was the SASS TDS survey count of 928 represented the specialists/librarians, but not the other professionals. Additionally, the count of 928 looked incorrect (see Section 3.6B, "other findings").

**Table 3-17. Library Media Specialist/Librarian Estimates for Public Schools:  
The Library Media Center Survey Compared to the Schools and Staffing Teacher Demand Survey by  
State, 1993-94**

By Alphabetical State Order				By Descending LMC/SASS Ratio	
	LMC Survey (C1)	SASS Survey (C2)	LMC/SASS (C1/C2)	LMC/SASS (C1/C2)	
United States	87,503.6	51,642.8	1.69	United States	1.69
Alabama	1,367.3	1,259.7	1.09	District of Columbia	42.23
Alaska	432.8	184.1	2.35	California	4.03
Arizona	1,208.9	936.3	1.29	South Dakota	3.58
Arkansas	1,256.0	923.9	1.36	Wyoming	3.04
California	6,929.7	1,718.0	4.03	Idaho	2.78
Colorado	1,452.3	589.8	2.46	Oregon	2.68
Connecticut	772.2	689.3	1.12	Montana	2.58
Delaware	167.6	109.5	1.53	Michigan	2.56
District of Columbia	168.9	4.0	42.23	Colorado	2.46
Florida	2,696.7	2,469.6	1.09	North Dakota	2.39
Georgia	2,360.4	1,943.9	1.21	Iowa	2.37
Hawaii	257.7	287.0	0.90	Nebraska	2.36
Idaho	606.1	217.8	2.78	Alaska	2.35
Illinois	4,380.6	1,941.6	2.26	Ohio	2.27
Indiana	1,984.1	1,137.4	1.74	Illinois	2.26
Iowa	1,888.5	796.0	2.37	New Mexico	2.22
Kansas	1,873.0	951.0	1.97	Oklahoma	2.11
Kentucky	1,626.6	1,157.0	1.41	Missouri	2.07
Louisiana	1,504.3	1,128.5	1.33	Kansas	1.97
Maine	593.9	305.9	1.94	Maine	1.94
Maryland	1,342.0	1,009.0	1.33	Minnesota	1.93
Massachusetts	1,481.0	892.1	1.66	Utah	1.89
Michigan	3,348.3	1,306.4	2.56	Nevada	1.82
Minnesota	1,766.5	913.5	1.93	Indiana	1.74
Mississippi	1,022.4	644.5	1.59	New Hampshire	1.72
Missouri	2,636.0	1,273.4	2.07	Wisconsin	1.69
Montana	1,101.0	426.3	2.58	New York	1.68
Nebraska	1,205.7	511.5	2.36	Massachusetts	1.66
Nevada	437.6	240.0	1.82	Mississippi	1.59
New Hampshire	415.3	241.5	1.72	Delaware	1.53
New Jersey	2,448.8	1,917.6	1.28	Pennsylvania	1.45
New Mexico	566.3	255.0	2.22	West Virginia	1.44
New York	4,257.1	2,526.6	1.68	Vermont	1.43
North Carolina	2,598.4	1,986.6	1.31	Kentucky	1.41
North Dakota	599.1	251.1	2.39	Rhode Island	1.40
Ohio	3,847.6	1,695.0	2.27	Texas	1.37
Oklahoma	2,065.2	978.0	2.11	Washington	1.37
Oregon	1,290.3	481.6	2.68	Arkansas	1.36
Pennsylvania	3,454.9	2,377.9	1.45	Louisiana	1.33
Rhode Island	322.2	230.6	1.40	Maryland	1.33
South Carolina	1,290.1	1,106.4	1.17	North Carolina	1.31
South Dakota	793.0	221.2	3.58	Arizona	1.29
Tennessee	1,626.3	1,373.6	1.18	New Jersey	1.28
Texas	5,930.9	4,336.3	1.37	Georgia	1.21
Utah	643.2	339.9	1.89	Tennessee	1.18
Vermont	380.5	266.1	1.43	South Carolina	1.17
Virginia	1,973.5	1,837.6	1.07	Connecticut	1.12
Washington	1,846.1	1,351.7	1.37	Florida	1.09
West Virginia	618.2	428.0	1.44	Alabama	1.09
Wisconsin	2,266.8	1,341.3	1.69	Virginia	1.07
Wyoming	401.4	132.2	3.04	Hawaii	0.90

Abbreviations: LMC = Library Media Center SASS = Schools and Staffing Survey  
TDS = Teacher Demand and Shortage Questionnaire for Public School Districts

**Notes:**

The LMC survey collects counts while the TDS survey collects specialists/ librarians in full-time equivalents. For this table, the LMC survey library media specialists/ librarians include other professionals working in the library. Also, the TDS survey may include specialists/ librarians at the school district level.

**Source:**

1993-94 Library Media Center Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

*Library Media Center Surveys Compared to Other Surveys - continued*

**Section 3.3A LMC and CCD State Nonfiscal Survey (Public): Librarian Definitions**

**Definitions and Items**

*LMC*

LMC Item 1a = “How many state-certified library media specialists work in this school’s library media center?”

*CCD*

“Librarians and Media Specialists -

Librarians are those professional staff members and supervisors who are assigned specific duties and school time to professional library service activities, including: selecting, acquiring, preparing, cataloging and circulating books and other printed materials; planning the use of the library by students, teachers and other members of the instructional staff; and guiding individuals in their use of library books and materials, whether maintained separately or as a part of an instructional materials center.”

**Discussion**

The public school LMC survey estimates of state-certified library media specialists can be compared to the CCD state nonfiscal survey’s universe counts of librarians and media specialists. The CCD state nonfiscal survey presented a definition of librarians and media specialists while the LMC survey did not. Depending on how the respondent interprets the surveys’ questions, instructions and definitions, the estimates may differ for any of the following reasons:

- 1) The two surveys had different units of collection. The CCD state nonfiscal survey collected in full-time equivalents, while the LMC survey collected counts. This factor should cause the LMC survey counts to be higher than the CCD survey counts.
- 2) For the public school LMC survey, state certification was required to be classified as a library media specialist. Library media specialists

who were not state certified should be considered other professionals working in the library. The CCD state nonfiscal survey did not make this distinction. This factor should cause the LMC survey counts to be lower than the CCD survey counts.

- 3) Respondents may have failed to note the state certification qualification on the request for counts of state-certified specialists. They may regard the LMC survey as requesting 1) librarians and 2) other professionals, instead of 1) state-certified librarians and 2) other librarians and professionals. This factor would cause the LMC survey state-certified specialist counts to be higher than the CCD state nonfiscal survey library media specialist counts.
- 4) For the CCD state nonfiscal survey, any professional fulfilling the duties of a librarian or library media specialist (state-certified or not) could be counted as a library media specialist. The introductory text for the staff counts section reinforces this with the statement “Staff counts are to be reported according to actual work assignments. In other words, if training or certification is different from assigned positions, report the counts according to assigned positions.” This factor should cause the LMC survey counts to be lower than the CCD survey counts.
- 5) The surveys had different levels of reporting. The CCD state nonfiscal survey data were collected at the state level, while the LMC survey data were collected at the school level. The CCD state nonfiscal survey’s counts may include staff providing district and regional level library services. District and regional level services were specifically excluded from the LMC survey. This factor should cause the LMC survey counts to be lower than the CCD survey counts.
- 6) The CCD state nonfiscal survey described librarians and media specialists as professionals working with “books and other printed materials.” The library and media support staff description did not exclude working with books and printed materials but focused on audiovisual equipment and materials. The implication was that professionals who worked with books and printed materials were librarians and media specialists and

those who worked with other resources were support staff. The LMC survey did not address this issue. If the respondent viewed this distinction as important, this factor should cause the LMC survey counts to be higher than the CCD survey counts.

### **Related Report Sections**

See Section 3.3B.

### **Section 3.3B LMC and CCD State Nonfiscal Survey (Public): Librarian Estimates**

#### **Comparison**

The LMC survey state-certified library media specialists estimates were compared to the CCD state nonfiscal survey librarians and media specialists counts.

#### **Hypothesis**

There are several possible reasons for differences in estimates as described in the Section 3.3A. Three could result in lower counts and three could result in higher counts for the LMC survey. The main considerations are: 1) the CCD state nonfiscal survey collected in FTE while the LMC survey collected counts, and 2) the LMC survey included only state-certified specialists in this estimate while the CCD state nonfiscal survey also included other librarians and professionals working in the library. These factors may cancel each other.

<p><b><i>Principal Finding:</i></b> The counts of library media specialists differed between surveys.</p>
---

#### **Tables**

Table 3-18 shows the data comparison results.

#### **Items**

See Section 3.3A.

#### **Results in a Nutshell**

The LMC survey state estimates were generally higher than the CCD state nonfiscal survey counts. This may be due to the different units of collection. It suggests, however, the surveys' terminology and definitions have a strong influence on reporting. The LMC survey estimation also may be a factor.

#### **Basic Findings**

The estimates from the LMC survey were generally higher than the CCD state nonfiscal survey counts. The ratios ranged from 0.80 to 3.56 with a national average of 1.32. Only five states had ratios of less than 1.0. The 928 reported for California was probably an error as discussed in Section 3.2B.

**Table 3-18. Library Media Specialist/Librarian Estimates for Public Schools:  
The Library Media Center Survey Compared to the Common Core of Data State Nonfiscal Survey by  
State, 1993-94**

By Alphabetical State Order				By Descending LMC/CCD Ratio	
	LMC Survey (C1)	CCD Survey (C2)	LMC/CCD (C1/C2)	LMC/CCD (C1/C2)	
United States	66,682.2	50,501	1.32	United States	1.32
Alabama	1,246.6	1,194	1.04	Rhode Island	3.56
Alaska	253.2	156	1.62	California	2.81
Arizona	825.2	773	1.07	South Dakota	2.78
Arkansas	1,101.2	948	1.16	Montana	2.64
California	2,608.7	928	2.81	North Dakota	2.56
Colorado	754.4	704	1.07	Wyoming	2.17
Connecticut	707.1	654	1.08	Iowa	2.08
Delaware	143.3	116	1.24	Massachusetts	2.05
District of Columbia	156.8	173	0.91	Idaho	1.91
Florida	2,370.4	2,513	0.94	Nebraska	1.74
Georgia	1,969.3	2,053	0.96	Missouri	1.69
Hawaii	230.2	286	0.80	Oklahoma	1.66
Idaho	320.9	168	1.91	Alaska	1.62
Illinois	2,936.1	1,973	1.49	Maine	1.60
Indiana	1,457.5	1,047	1.39	Kansas	1.55
Iowa	1,354.0	652	2.08	West Virginia	1.53
Kansas	1,503.7	973	1.55	Utah	1.51
Kentucky	1,420.1	1,187	1.20	New Mexico	1.49
Louisiana	1,240.1	1,217	1.02	Ohio	1.49
Maine	384.5	241	1.60	Illinois	1.49
Maryland	1,239.1	1,078	1.15	Minnesota	1.45
Massachusetts	1,160.7	567	2.05	Pennsylvania	1.44
Michigan	2,022.1	1,500	1.35	Vermont	1.43
Minnesota	1,429.6	984	1.45	Wisconsin	1.43
Mississippi	780.8	640	1.22	Indiana	1.39
Missouri	2,130.2	1,261	1.69	Michigan	1.35
Montana	895.9	339	2.64	New York	1.34
Nebraska	973.4	558	1.74	New Jersey	1.25
Nevada	281.1	239	1.18	Delaware	1.24
New Hampshire	301.4	254	1.19	Texas	1.23
New Jersey	2,251.9	1,800	1.25	Mississippi	1.22
New Mexico	362.7	243	1.49	Oregon	1.21
New York	3,987.0	2,983	1.34	Kentucky	1.20
North Carolina	2,203.3	2,151	1.02	New Hampshire	1.19
North Dakota	458.5	179	2.56	Tennessee	1.18
Ohio	2,650.3	1,776	1.49	Nevada	1.18
Oklahoma	1,429.5	860	1.66	Arkansas	1.16
Oregon	802.9	665	1.21	Maryland	1.15
Pennsylvania	3,120.9	2,170	1.44	Connecticut	1.08
Rhode Island	292.0	82	3.56	South Carolina	1.08
South Carolina	1,167.5	1,085	1.08	Colorado	1.07
South Dakota	578.6	208	2.78	Arizona	1.07
Tennessee	1,514.4	1,280	1.18	Washington	1.07
Texas	5,100.8	4,143	1.23	Alabama	1.04
Utah	403.8	267	1.51	North Carolina	1.02
Vermont	284.2	199	1.43	Louisiana	1.02
Virginia	1,783.4	1,945	0.92	Georgia	0.96
Washington	1,339.3	1,255	1.07	Florida	0.94
West Virginia	550.3	360	1.53	Virginia	0.92
Wisconsin	1,910.8	1,339	1.43	District of Columbia	0.91
Wyoming	292.4	135	2.17	Hawaii	0.80

Abbreviations: CCD = Common Core of Data

LMC = Library Media Center

**Notes:**

The CCD state nonfiscal survey collects data in full-time equivalents, while the LMC survey collects counts. For the LMC survey, the data include those working with computer resources. For the CCD survey, the data may include library media specialists/ librarians providing district and regional level media services.

**Source:**

1993-94 Library Media Center Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)  
1993-94 Common Core of Data State Nonfiscal Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

## *Library Media Specialist Surveys Compared to Other Surveys*

### **Section 3.4A LMS and SASS Surveys (Public, Private and BIA): Librarian Classification of Main Assignment, and Full-Time and Part-Time Definitions**

#### **Definitions and Items**

##### *LMS*

- LMS Item 2 = “How do you classify your MAIN assignment at THIS school (i.e., the activity at which you spend MOST of your time) this school year?”
- LMS Check Box 1 = “Itinerant library media specialist/librarian (i.e., your assignment requires you to provide library media services at more than one school)”
- LMS Check Box 2 = “Regular full-time library media specialist/librarian at this school”
- LMS Check Box 3 = “Part-time library media specialist/librarian”
- LMS Check Box 4 = “Long-term substitute library media specialist/librarian (i.e., your assignment requires that you fill the role of a regular library media specialist/librarian on a long-term basis, but you are still considered a substitute)”
- LMS Check Box 5 = “Classroom teacher”
- LMS Check Box 6 = “Other professional staff (e.g., counselor, curriculum coordinator, administrator)”
- LMS Check Box 7 = “Unpaid parent volunteer”
- LMS Check Box 8 = “Library aide”
- LMS Check Box 9 = “Support staff (e.g., secretary, clerk, etc.)”

##### *SASS*

- SASS Item 16e = “Library media specialists or librarians - part-time”
- SASS Item 17e = “Library media specialists or librarians - full-time”

#### **Discussion**

There was no definition for specialists/librarians on either survey. For the SASS survey, a count is requested for “library media specialists or librarians.” The SASS survey said to report by function. The LMS survey stated that it is “intended for the school employee who is responsible for this school’s library, that is, the library media specialist or librarian.” A definition of the library follows, effectively defining librarians. The definition was the same as the one for the LMC survey.

There were two comparisons that can be made:

- 1) The respondent’s main assignment on the LMS survey could be compared to the SASS survey responses. This comparison could be done at the school level for all types of schools. The LMS survey asked the respondent to indicate their main assignment: librarian, teacher, other professional staff, parent volunteer, library aide, or support staff. The SASS survey requested counts of library media specialists or librarians by function, not occupation.

Agreement between the two surveys’ responses for each school was expected. For example, if the LMS survey respondent was a full-time librarian, the SASS survey for the same school should have a count of at least one for full-time specialists/librarians. If the LMS survey respondent was a teacher working part time in the library, the SASS survey should have at least one for the part-time specialist/librarian category.

- 2) For those LMS survey respondents who classify their main assignment as librarians, full-time and part-time reporting can be compared between the LMS and SASS surveys. Specialists/librarians indicated status as itinerant, full time, part time or long-term substitute on the LMS survey. The SASS survey counts of specialists/librarians were by full time and part time. This comparison could

be done at the state level for public and BIA schools.

The instructions for volunteers differed between the surveys. The SASS survey did not mention volunteers or state that staff must be paid. The LMS survey separated parent volunteers<sup>31</sup>. For the private school findings, the lack of instructions concerning volunteers on the SASS survey was a notable factor: 5.7 percent of the part-time staff reported on the SASS survey for private schools were volunteers per the LMS survey.

The instructions for reporting part-time staff differed. The SASS survey said to report employees who serve more than one function as part time under each function and to report shared employees as part time. The LMS survey did not address these issues. The findings suggested that the part-time instructions on the SASS survey work well. Classroom teachers and other professional staff working part time in the library were reported on the SASS survey as part-time specialists/librarians as instructed.

### Related Report Sections

See Sections 3.4B and 3.4C.

### Section 3.4B LMS and SASS Surveys (Public, Private and BIA): Librarian Classification of Main Assignment Counts

#### Comparison

The LMS respondent's main assignment was compared to the SASS survey counts of full-time and part-time specialist/librarians.

#### Hypothesis

The responses for each school are expected to agree between the surveys.

**Principal Findings:** The reporting between surveys for full-time librarians was fairly consistent. The reporting for part-time librarians was not.

#### Tables

---

<sup>31</sup>Although some respondents other than the parent volunteers may be volunteers, this report assumes all respondents except the parent volunteers are paid staff.

Tables 3-19 and 3-20 show the relationships for linked schools. These schools could be in-scope or out-of-scope. Table 3-19 presents the LMS response and then checks how the SASS survey respondent reported. Table 3-20 presents the opposite viewpoint of looking at the SASS survey response and then checks how the LMS survey respondent reported.

#### Items

See Section 3.4A.

#### Results in a Nutshell

There was high agreement in reporting for full-time librarians between surveys for public and BIA schools. There were, however, a notable number of cases where a full-time respondent on the LMS survey was reported as part time on the SASS survey for private schools. Also, there were a notable number of part-time specialist/librarians on the LMS survey reported as full time on the SASS survey for all types of schools. The presence or absence of instructions for reporting part-time staff serving more than one function or school and instructions for volunteers were important factors for the surveys.

#### Intersurvey Agreement and Disagreement

##### Intersurvey Agreement

Table 3-19 starts with the LMS survey responses and shows the matching school's response on the SASS survey. It shows a consistency in reporting across types of schools. It also shows high agreement in reporting for full-time librarians between surveys for public and BIA schools. The agreement between full timers on the LMS survey and full timers on the SASS survey was 82.3 percent for the public schools, 77.0 percent for the private schools, and 91.2 percent for the BIA schools. The agreement between part timers on the LMS survey and part timers on the SASS survey was lower, but again similar, for all three types of schools: 63.3 percent for the public schools, 70.0 percent for the private schools, and 56.3 percent for the BIA schools.

Table 3-20 starts with the SASS survey responses and examines the matching school's response on the LMS survey. There was fairly high agreement for schools reporting at least one full-time library media specialist/librarian on the SASS survey. The agreement for a regular full-time specialist or librarian completing the LMS survey was: 73.3 percent of the public

schools, 73.4 percent of the private schools, and 75.4 percent of the BIA schools. The agreement between part timers reported on the SASS survey to part timers answering the LMS survey was good when the part-time library media specialists/librarians, itinerant specialists/librarians, long-term substitute librarian, teachers and other professional staff are added together (the SASS survey says to apportion reporting by function): 66.7 percent for public schools, 55.6 percent for private schools, and 65.4 percent for BIA schools.

#### Intersurvey Disagreement

Table 3-19 shows how the SASS survey respondent reported when the LMS survey respondent reported one full-time or one part-time librarian. The instances of a full timer on the LMS survey reported as a part timer on the SASS survey were relatively low for the public and BIA schools, 8.8 and 5.3 percent, respectively. It was notable, 18.4 percent, for the private schools. Cases where the part-time library media specialist on the LMS survey was reported as full time on the SASS survey are notable: 25.9 percent for public schools, 17.4 percent for private schools, and 25.0 percent for BIA schools.

Table 3-20 shows how the LMS survey respondent reported when the SASS survey reported at least one full-time specialist/librarian. Most of the difference in public school full-time counts between the surveys was due to 141 (9.5 percent) LMS survey nonrespondents, 79 (5.3 percent) who reported as itinerant librarians, and 74 (5.0 percent) who were part-time librarians. For private schools, most of the difference was due to 63 (10.5 percent) reporting as part time, and 40 (6.7 percent) nonrespondents on the LMS surveys. For the BIA schools, the bulk of the differences was divided fairly evenly over four (5.8 percent) part timers, four (5.8 percent) classroom teachers, three (4.3 percent) itinerant librarians, and three (4.3 percent) nonrespondents.

Table 3-20 also shows how the LMS survey respondent reported when the SASS survey reported at least one part-time specialist/librarian. The rates of library aides and parent volunteers on the LMS survey reported as part-time specialists/librarians on the SASS survey are notable.

#### Other Findings

Nonrespondents

The nonrespondent category on Table 3-20 for the LMS surveys is notable. For full-time staff, the nonrespondent rates were 9.5 percent for the public schools, 6.7 percent for the private schools, and 4.3 percent for the BIA schools. For part-time staff, the nonrespondent rates were 7.5 percent for the public schools, 9.1 percent for the private schools, and 13.8 percent for the BIA schools.

#### Section 3.4C LMS and SASS Surveys (Public and BIA): Librarian Full-Time and Part-Time Estimates

##### Comparison

Estimates of full-time and part-time specialists/librarians were compared by state and by type of school between the LMS and SASS surveys.

##### Hypothesis

The SASS survey estimates should be higher than the LMS survey estimates primarily because the LMS survey covers only the respondent.

**Principal Findings:** The reporting for full-time and part-time specialists was consistent across surveys.

##### Tables

Tables 3-21 through 3-25 show the estimates.

##### Items

See Section 3.4A.

##### Results in a Nutshell

Expectations were met at the national level and for most states. Estimation may be the cause for states not meeting expectations.

##### Basic Findings

Because the SASS survey was a sample of the CCD universe, the results of a data comparison between the LMS survey and the SASS survey should be (and were) similar. The public school LMS/CCD survey ratio for librarians and media specialists was 0.72 (see Section 3.6B). The ratios of the LMS survey estimates to the SASS survey estimates were 0.57 and 0.80 for public

and BIA schools, respectively, for full-time specialists/librarians.

For those selecting the part-time check box, the ratios were 0.27 and 0.61 for the public and BIA schools, respectively. As shown in Table 3-24, however, a more accurate picture of the public schools part timers includes itinerant and long-term substitute librarians and results in a ratio of 0.61.

## **Other Findings**

### **Estimation**

For some states on Table 3-23, there was zero reporting on one survey, but data reported on the other survey. The ratios were shown as zero. As Table 3-24 shows, however, the zero totals for the LMS survey virtually disappeared when the itinerant and long-term substitute specialists/librarians also were assumed to be part time.

<b>Table 3-19. Full-Time and Part-Time Counts for Library Media Specialists/Librarians by Type of School: The Schools and Staffing Survey Compared to the Library Media Specialist Survey for Linked Schools, 1993-94</b>							
		<b>Specialist/Librarian on the LMS Survey</b>					
		<b>Full Time</b>			<b>Part Time</b>		
		<b>Public LMS (C1)</b>	<b>Private LMS (C2)</b>	<b>BIA LMS (C3)</b>	<b>Public LMS (C4)</b>	<b>Private LMS (C5)</b>	<b>BIA LMS (C6)</b>
<b>Specialist/Librarian on the SASS Survey</b>	<b>Full time</b>	1,086 (82.3%)	439 (77.0%)	52 (91.2%)	74 (25.9%)	63 (17.4%)	4 (25.0%)
	<b>Part time</b>	116 (8.8%)	105 (18.4%)	3 (5.3%)	181 (63.3%)	254 (70.0%)	9 (56.3%)
	<b>Other</b>	117 (8.9%)	26 (4.6%)	2 (3.5%)	31 (10.8%)	46 (12.7%)	3 (18.8%)
<b>Total</b>		1,319	570	57	286	363	16

Abbreviations:

BIA = Bureau of Indian Affairs

LMS = Library Media Specialist/Librarian Survey

SASS = Schools and Staffing Survey

Notes:

Linked = Linked schools are those matching by identification number between surveys. The schools are on both surveys' mailing lists, that is, sample.

Other = Either the school was a nonrespondent or there were no specialists/librarians reported. Nonrespondent schools either are a nonresponse or have insufficient response: there is a school but the responses are insufficient for inclusion in the tabulated data.

Source: 1993-94 Library Media Specialist/Librarian Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

1993-94 Schools and Staffing Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

**Table 3-20. Librarian Classification of Main Assignment Counts by Type of School:  
The Library Media Specialist Survey Compared to the Schools and Staffing Survey  
for Linked Schools, 1993-94**

LMS Survey - Classification of Main Assignment  (C1)	At Least One Specialist/Librarian on the SASS Survey who is:					
	Full Time			Part Time		
	Public (C2)	Private (C3)	BIA (C4)	Public (C5)	Private (C6)	BIA (C7)
<b>Regular full-time specialist/librarian</b>	1,086 (73.3%)	439 (73.4%)	52 (75.4%)	116 (16.2%)	105 (17.1%)	3 (10.3%)
<b>Part-time specialist/librarian</b>	74 (5.0%)	63 (10.5%)	4 (5.8%)	181 (25.2%)	254 (41.4%)	9 (31.0%)
<b>Itinerant specialist/librarian</b>	79 (5.3%)	8 (1.3%)	3 (4.3%)	241 (33.6%)	9 (1.5%)	7 (24.1%)
<b>Long-term substitute specialist/librarian</b>	9 (1.0%)	2 (0.3%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (0.6%)	5 (0.8%)	0 (0.0%)
<b>Classroom teacher</b>	19 (1.0%)	11 (1.8%)	4 (5.8%)	38 (5.3%)	51 (8.3%)	2 (6.9%)
<b>Other professional staff</b>	2 (0.1%)	8 (1.3%)	1 (1.4%)	14 (2.0%)	22 (3.6%)	1 (3.4%)
<b>Support staff</b>	5 (0.3%)	4 (0.7%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (0.4%)	9 (1.5%)	0 (0.0%)
<b>Library aide</b>	45 (3.0%)	1 (0.2%)	1 (1.4%)	32 (4.5%)	9 (1.5%)	2 (6.9%)
<b>Parent volunteer</b>	0 (0.0%)	7 (1.2%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	35 (5.7%)	1 (3.4%)
<b>Nonrespondent<sup>2</sup></b>	141 (9.5%)	40 (6.7%)	3 (4.3%)	54 (7.5%)	56 (9.1%)	4 (13.8%)
<b>Out-of-scope<sup>3</sup></b>	22 (1.5%)	15 (2.5%)	1 (1.4%)	34 (4.7%)	58 (9.5%)	0 (0.0%)
<b>Total</b>	1,482	598	69	717	613	29

Abbreviations:

LMS = Library Media Specialist/Librarian Survey

SASS = Schools and Staffing Survey

Notes:

Linked = Linked schools are those matching by identification number between schools. The schools are on both surveys' mailing lists, that is, sample.

Nonrespondent = Either a nonresponse or insufficient response: the school has a librarian, but the remainder of the survey responses are insufficient for inclusion in the tabulated data.

Out-of-scope = For the LMS survey, the school reported no librarians or has no library.

Source: 1993-94 Library Media Specialist/Librarian Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)  
1993-94 Schools and Staffing Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

**Table 3-21. Full-Time Library Media Specialist/Librarian Estimates for Public Schools:  
The Library Media Specialist Survey Compared to the Schools and Staffing Survey  
by State, 1993-94**

By Alphabetical State Order				By Descending LMS/SASS Ratio		
LMS Survey (C1)	SASS Survey (C2)	LMS/SASS (C1/C2)		LMS/SASS (C1/C2)		
United States	29,796.4	52,032.1	0.57		United States	0.57
Alabama	1,107.7	1,199.7	0.92		South Dakota	1.54
Alaska	15.0	187.1	0.08		North Dakota	1.37
Arizona	458.0	834.5	0.55		Iowa	1.33
Arkansas	851.6	951.1	0.90		Oklahoma	1.31
California	2,306.3	2,494.9	0.92		Maine	1.29
Colorado	482.7	928.5	0.52		Montana	1.27
Connecticut	89.0	599.2	0.15		Wyoming	1.17
Delaware	29.2	140.6	0.21		Kansas	1.17
District of Columbia	12.7	157.4	0.08		Nebraska	1.05
Florida	755.3	2,512.4	0.30		Missouri	1.00
Georgia	674.9	1,917.0	0.35		California	0.92
Hawaii	56.0	259.3	0.22		Alabama	0.92
Idaho	203.5	238.9	0.85		Mississippi	0.91
Illinois	1,140.2	2,081.2	0.55		New Mexico	0.90
Indiana	665.5	1,195.8	0.56		Arkansas	0.90
Iowa	792.8	596.3	1.33		Utah	0.89
Kansas	786.6	674.1	1.17		Idaho	0.85
Kentucky	370.9	1,097.8	0.34		Louisiana	0.82
Louisiana	935.8	1,146.0	0.82		West Virginia	0.77
Maine	313.7	242.4	1.29		Texas	0.74
Maryland	141.5	1,026.8	0.14		New Hampshire	0.74
Massachusetts	397.8	799.3	0.50		North Carolina	0.69
Michigan	507.2	1,724.3	0.29		Tennessee	0.67
Minnesota	533.6	831.3	0.64		Minnesota	0.64
Mississippi	709.9	782.8	0.91		Oregon	0.58
Missouri	1,115.6	1,113.3	1.00		Indiana	0.56
Montana	347.7	273.1	1.27		Arizona	0.55
Nebraska	477.0	453.1	1.05		Illinois	0.55
Nevada	99.2	311.2	0.32		Colorado	0.52
New Hampshire	155.7	210.3	0.74		Massachusetts	0.50
New Jersey	108.1	1,549.2	0.07		Rhode Island	0.48
New Mexico	344.7	383.1	0.90		South Carolina	0.46
New York	551.0	2,978.2	0.19		Wisconsin	0.45
North Carolina	1,355.3	1,951.3	0.69		Vermont	0.42
North Dakota	149.0	108.9	1.37		Virginia	0.42
Ohio	844.0	2,093.1	0.40		Ohio	0.40
Oklahoma	1,179.4	897.7	1.31		Pennsylvania	0.40
Oregon	304.9	523.6	0.58		Georgia	0.35
Pennsylvania	786.3	1,981.3	0.40		Kentucky	0.34
Rhode Island	68.9	144.3	0.48		Nevada	0.32
South Carolina	499.3	1,091.1	0.46		Washington	0.31
South Dakota	286.1	186.4	1.54		Florida	0.30
Tennessee	882.6	1,312.0	0.67		Michigan	0.29
Texas	3,298.0	4,442.2	0.74		Hawaii	0.22
Utah	328.3	367.8	0.89		Delaware	0.21
Vermont	77.6	183.4	0.42		New York	0.19
Virginia	716.0	1,691.1	0.42		Connecticut	0.15
Washington	402.4	1,280.8	0.31		Maryland	0.14
West Virginia	311.9	404.4	0.77		District of Columbia	0.08
Wisconsin	592.5	1,331.2	0.45		Alaska	0.08
Wyoming	177.3	151.5	1.17		New Jersey	0.07

Abbreviations:

LMS = Library Media Specialist

SASS = Schools and Staffing Survey

Notes:

The LMS survey covers the respondent only.

Source:

1993-94 Library Media Specialist Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

1993-94 Schools and Staffing Survey data file (U. S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

**Table 3-22. Full-Time Library Media Specialist/Librarian Estimates for Bureau of Indian Affair Schools: The Library Media Specialist Survey Compared to the Schools and Staffing Survey by State, 1993-94**

<b>By Alphabetical State Order</b>				<b>By Descending LMS/SASS Ratio</b>	
<b>LMS Survey</b>	<b>SASS Survey</b>	<b>LMS/SASS</b>		<b>LMS/SASS</b>	
<b>(C1)</b>	<b>(C2)</b>	<b>(C1/C2)</b>		<b>(C1/C2)</b>	
United States	75.6	94.2	0.80	United States	0.80
Arizona	24.2	30.2	0.80	California	1.54
California	1.5	1.0	1.54	Oregon	1.30
Kansas	1.0	1.0	0.91	Wisconsin	1.15
Michigan	0.7	1.0	0.72	North Carolina	1.08
Minnesota	2.5	3.1	0.82	Oklahoma	1.08
Mississippi	1.1	0.0	0.00	North Dakota	1.04
New Mexico	20.3	22.2	0.92	New Mexico	0.92
North Carolina	2.2	2.0	1.08	Kansas	0.91
North Dakota	8.3	8.0	1.04	Minnesota	0.82
Oklahoma	2.2	2.0	1.08	Arizona	0.80
Oregon	1.3	1.0	1.30	Michigan	0.72
South Dakota	7.8	18.5	0.42	Washington	0.64
Utah	0.0	1.0	0.00	South Dakota	0.42
Washington	1.3	2.0	0.64	Mississippi	0.00
Wisconsin	1.1	1.0	1.15	Utah	0.00

Abbreviations:

LMS = Library Media Specialist/Librarian

SASS = Schools and Staffing Survey

Notes:

The LMS survey covers the respondent only.

Source:

1993-94 Library Media Specialist /Librarian Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

1993-94 Schools and Staffing Survey data file (U. S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

**Table 3-23. Part-Time Library Media Specialist/Librarian Estimates for Public Schools:  
The Library Media Specialist Survey Compared to the Schools and Staffing Survey  
by State, 1993-94**

<b>By Alphabetical State Order</b>				<b>By Descending LMS/SASS Ratio</b>	
<b>LMS Survey</b>	<b>SASS Survey</b>	<b>LMS/SASS</b>		<b>LMS/SASS</b>	
<b>(C1)</b>	<b>(C2)</b>	<b>(C1/C2)</b>		<b>(C1/C2)</b>	
United States	6,325.1	23,093.5	0.27	United States	0.27
Alabama	15.1	77.6	0.19	Georgia	0.92
Alaska	38.9	127.9	0.30	California	0.76
Arizona	0.0	165.8	0.00	West Virginia	0.64
Arkansas	54.6	182.8	0.30	North Dakota	0.63
California	1,751.0	2,318.3	0.76	South Dakota	0.59
Colorado	151.7	311.0	0.49	Montana	0.57
Connecticut	42.5	219.1	0.19	Nebraska	0.51
Delaware	1.9	36.8	0.05	Vermont	0.51
District of Columbia	0.0	2.5	0.00	Colorado	0.49
Florida	2.3	52.6	0.04	Idaho	0.46
Georgia	56.4	61.3	0.92	New Jersey	0.38
Hawaii	0.0	2.6	0.00	South Carolina	0.36
Idaho	101.6	219.6	0.46	Illinois	0.35
Illinois	432.9	1,223.2	0.35	Oklahoma	0.33
Indiana	39.0	603.9	0.06	Michigan	0.32
Iowa	188.0	887.1	0.21	Washington	0.31
Kansas	78.7	809.5	0.10	Alaska	0.30
Kentucky	66.4	361.9	0.18	Arkansas	0.30
Louisiana	63.7	258.4	0.25	Missouri	0.27
Maine	20.0	213.5	0.09	Wisconsin	0.25
Maryland	29.2	284.0	0.10	Louisiana	0.25
Massachusetts	43.1	570.2	0.08	Utah	0.22
Michigan	207.9	641.1	0.32	Virginia	0.22
Minnesota	62.1	671.1	0.09	Iowa	0.21
Mississippi	2.0	67.9	0.03	New Hampshire	0.21
Missouri	285.7	1,074.1	0.27	Oregon	0.20
Montana	310.6	542.7	0.57	Alabama	0.19
Nebraska	270.5	527.9	0.51	Connecticut	0.19
Nevada	6.7	43.1	0.16	Kentucky	0.18
New Hampshire	31.8	154.2	0.21	North Carolina	0.17
New Jersey	274.5	717.4	0.38	Nevada	0.16
New Mexico	13.6	138.4	0.10	Tennessee	0.15
New York	0.0	1,016.2	0.00	Wyoming	0.15
North Carolina	43.2	260.6	0.17	Maryland	0.10
North Dakota	226.5	359.8	0.63	New Mexico	0.10
Ohio	64.7	1,285.4	0.05	Rhode Island	0.10
Oklahoma	253.7	772.7	0.33	Kansas	0.10
Oregon	80.6	402.5	0.20	Maine	0.09
Pennsylvania	0.0	1,275.9	0.00	Minnesota	0.09
Rhode Island	15.5	158.6	0.10	Massachusetts	0.08
South Carolina	20.8	57.4	0.36	Indiana	0.06
South Dakota	237.0	403.6	0.59	Delaware	0.05
Tennessee	42.0	283.5	0.15	Ohio	0.05
Texas	54.6	1,166.6	0.05	Texas	0.05
Utah	39.6	178.2	0.22	Florida	0.04
Vermont	63.6	124.5	0.51	Mississippi	0.03
Virginia	22.4	103.1	0.22	Arizona	0.00
Washington	152.3	496.1	0.31	Hawaii	0.00
West Virginia	139.6	218.5	0.64	New York	0.00
Wisconsin	204.5	810.5	0.25	District of Columbia	0.00
Wyoming	22.3	152.3	0.15	Pennsylvania	0.00

Abbreviations: LMS = Library Media Specialist/Librarian

SASS = Schools and Staffing Survey

Notes:

The LMS survey covers the respondent only.

Source:

1993-94 Library Media Specialist/Librarian Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)  
1993-94 Schools and Staffing Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

**Table 3-24. Part-Time, Itinerant or Long-Term Substitute Library Media Specialist/Librarian Estimates for Public Schools: The Library Media Specialist Survey Compared to the Schools and Staffing Survey by State, 1993-94**

By Alphabetical State Order				By Descending LMS/SASS Ratio	
	LMS Survey	SASS Survey	LMS/SASS	LMS/SASS	
	(C1)	(C2)	(C1/C2)	(C1/C2)	
United States	14,160.9	23,093.5	0.61	United States	0.61
Alabama	53.8	77.6	0.69	Mississippi	2.11
Alaska	38.9	127.9	0.30	Hawaii	1.42
Arizona	79.4	165.8	0.48	Arkansas	1.21
Arkansas	221.3	182.8	1.21	West Virginia	1.17
California	2,404.2	2,318.3	1.04	Virginia	1.11
Colorado	218.2	311.0	0.70	California	1.04
Connecticut	73.0	219.1	0.33	Nebraska	1.03
Delaware	5.7	36.8	0.15	Georgia	0.92
District of Columbia	0.0	2.5	0.00	South Dakota	0.89
Florida	21.7	52.6	0.41	Illinois	0.88
Georgia	56.4	61.3	0.92	Montana	0.86
Hawaii	3.7	2.6	1.42	North Dakota	0.86
Idaho	123.0	219.6	0.56	Oklahoma	0.80
Illinois	1,072.6	1,223.2	0.88	Maine	0.77
Indiana	108.6	603.9	0.18	Tennessee	0.77
Iowa	684.6	887.1	0.77	Iowa	0.77
Kansas	586.3	809.5	0.72	Vermont	0.73
Kentucky	124.5	361.9	0.34	Kansas	0.72
Louisiana	167.9	258.4	0.65	Texas	0.72
Maine	165.3	213.5	0.77	Missouri	0.71
Maryland	29.2	284.0	0.10	Colorado	0.70
Massachusetts	301.3	570.2	0.53	Alabama	0.69
Michigan	343.9	641.1	0.54	Louisiana	0.65
Minnesota	290.7	671.1	0.43	Wyoming	0.64
Mississippi	143.3	67.9	2.11	North Carolina	0.64
Missouri	757.5	1,074.1	0.71	Utah	0.62
Montana	469.4	542.7	0.86	Idaho	0.56
Nebraska	543.9	527.9	1.03	New Mexico	0.55
Nevada	6.7	43.1	0.16	Michigan	0.54
New Hampshire	69.0	154.2	0.45	Massachusetts	0.53
New Jersey	354.8	717.4	0.49	New Jersey	0.49
New Mexico	76.0	138.4	0.55	Wisconsin	0.49
New York	105.9	1,016.2	0.10	Arizona	0.48
North Carolina	165.5	260.6	0.64	New Hampshire	0.45
North Dakota	308.9	359.8	0.86	Minnesota	0.43
Ohio	249.0	1,285.4	0.19	South Carolina	0.42
Oklahoma	619.2	772.7	0.80	Rhode Island	0.42
Oregon	126.6	402.5	0.31	Florida	0.41
Pennsylvania	239.1	1,275.9	0.19	Washington	0.36
Rhode Island	66.3	158.6	0.42	Kentucky	0.34
South Carolina	24.1	57.4	0.42	Connecticut	0.33
South Dakota	359.7	403.6	0.89	Oregon	0.31
Tennessee	219.1	283.5	0.77	Alaska	0.30
Texas	835.6	1,166.6	0.72	Ohio	0.19
Utah	110.6	178.2	0.62	Pennsylvania	0.19
Vermont	91.3	124.5	0.73	Indiana	0.18
Virginia	114.6	103.1	1.11	Nevada	0.16
Washington	179.2	496.1	0.36	Delaware	0.15
West Virginia	254.9	218.5	1.17	New York	0.10
Wisconsin	399.5	810.5	0.49	Maryland	0.10
Wyoming	97.0	152.3	0.64	District of Columbia	0.00

Abbreviations: LMS = Library Media Specialist/Librarian

SASS = Schools and Staffing Survey

Notes:

The LMS survey covers the respondent only.

Source:

1993-94 Library Media Specialist /Librarian Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)  
 1993-94 Schools and Staffing Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

**Table 3-25. Part-Time Library Media Specialist/Librarian Estimates for Bureau of Indian Affairs Schools: The Library Media Specialist Survey Compared to the Schools and Staffing Survey by State, 1993-94**

<b>By Alphabetical State Order</b>				<b>By Descending LMS/SASS Ratio</b>	
<b>LMS Survey</b>	<b>SASS Survey</b>	<b>LMS/SASS</b>		<b>LMS/SASS</b>	
<b>(C1)</b>	<b>(C2)</b>	<b>(C1/C2)</b>		<b>(C1/C2)</b>	
United States	19.1	31.1	0.61	United States	0.61
Arizona	2.2	9.0	0.24	Montana	2.13
Florida	1.2	1.0	1.21	Nevada	1.28
Iowa	1.1	1.0	1.13	Florida	1.21
Mississippi	0.0	1.0	0.00	Wyoming	1.21
Montana	2.1	1.0	2.13	Washington	1.16
Nevada	1.3	1.0	1.28	Iowa	1.13
New Mexico	4.7	6.0	0.78	New Mexico	0.78
North Dakota	2.5	4.0	0.63	North Dakota	0.63
South Dakota	1.5	5.1	0.30	South Dakota	0.30
Washington	1.2	1.0	1.16	Arizona	0.24
Wyoming	1.3	1.0	1.21	Mississippi	0.00

Abbreviations:

LMS = Library Media Specialist/Librarian

SASS = Schools and Staffing Survey

Notes:

The LMS survey covers the respondent only.

Source:

1993-94 Library Media Specialist/Librarian Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

1993-94 Schools and Staffing Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

*Library Media Specialist Surveys Compared to Other Surveys - continued*

**Section 3.5A LMS and SASS Survey (Public): Librarian Role in Decision Making Definitions**

**Definitions and Items**

*LMS*

- LMS Item 21a = “For each of the following statements, indicate whether you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree.”
- LMS Item 21b = “The school administration’s behavior toward the library media center staff is supportive and encouraging.”
- LMS Item 21f = “The principal talks with me frequently about the library media program.”
- LMS Item 21o = “This school’s administration knows the problems faced by the library media staff.”
- LMS Item 21g = “Most of my colleagues in this school share my beliefs and values about what the central mission of the library media program should be.”
- LMS Item 21i = “There is a great deal of cooperative effort among staff members in this school.”
- LMS Item 21u = “I plan with teachers for the integration of library media services into the curriculum.”
- LMS Item 21w = “My role as a library media specialist/librarian is well understood by the faculty in this school.”

*SASS*

- SASS Item 33a = “Does this school have a decision-making body other than a school board, student council, parent/teacher association (PTA), or parent/teacher organization (PTO)?”
- SASS Item 33c = “[The decision-making team] Brings administrators and teachers together on school resource issues”

**Discussion**

The public school SASS survey asked if there was a school decision-making body that brings administrators, teachers, parents, students, and other community representatives together on school resource issues; it did not refer to librarians. The public school LMS survey asked for the library media specialist/librarian’s opinion on factors relating to inclusion in school-wide decision making. Both linked schools counts and national estimates for the SASS survey and the LMS survey can be examined for agreement. For example, if there was a decision-making body, positive responses on the LMS survey should indicated the librarian/library media specialist was included.

Responses to Items 21b through 21w on the LMS survey were indicative of the inclusion or exclusion of the librarian in any decision-making body.

For purposes of comparison (see Section 3.5B), positive responses to two of Items 21b, 21f or 21o were considered indicative of cooperation between the librarian and the school’s administration. Positive responses to two of Items 21g, 21i, 21u or 21w were considered indicative of cooperation in decision making between the librarian and the teaching staff.

**Related Report Sections**

See Section 3.5B.

## Section 3.5B LMS and SASS Survey (Public): Librarian Role in Decision Making Counts

### Comparison

Items on the SASS survey indicating the presence of a decision-making body were compared to items indicating the inclusion of the librarian in decisions on the LMS survey.

### Hypothesis

The data should show a consistency between the surveys.

**Principal Findings:** There was a fair amount of consistency between the surveys.

### Tables

Table 3-26 shows the data comparison results.

### Items

See Section 3.5A.

### Results in a Nutshell

More than half of the specialists/librarians felt included in decision making for schools reporting a decision-making body that brings administrators and teachers together, according to the LMS survey. The percentage of librarians who felt included in decision making was higher for all schools, with or without a decision-making team, than for those with a decision-making team.

### Intersurvey Agreement and Disagreement

#### Intersurvey Agreement

More than half of the specialists/librarians working for linked schools reporting a decision-making team were included in decision making. There were slightly more included in decision making with administration

than with teachers. On the SASS survey, 3,626 schools indicated the presence of a decision-making body that brought administrators and teachers together. Of these, 980 linked to the LMS survey. For the 980 schools, 556 (56.7 percent) of the specialists/librarians reported they were included in decision making with the school's administration. There were 514 (52.4 percent) indicating involvement in decision making with the school's faculty. There were 526 (53.7 percent) reporting they were included by both administrators and faculty.

#### Intersurvey Disagreement

For the 980 SASS survey schools reporting a decision-making body that brings administrators and teachers together and linking to the LMS survey, 119 (12.1 percent) specialists/librarians reported no involvement in decision making with administration on the LMS survey. Another 161 (16.4 percent) reported no inclusion in decision making with faculty. Sixty-seven (6.8 percent) indicated no inclusion in decision making in a joint librarian/administration/faculty team.

This does not, however, necessarily indicate disagreement in reporting between the surveys. The SASS survey does not mention librarians as part of the decision-making body. It may be that librarians are not included on the teams for these schools.

### Other Findings

#### Estimation

Table 3-26 shows estimates for all, not just linked, in-scope schools for the two surveys for librarian involvement in decision making. It was interesting that the percentage of counts of librarians who felt included in decision making was higher for all schools, 67.3 percent, than for the 980 schools with a decision-making team, 53.7 percent. Perhaps the presence of a formal team clarified whether the librarian was or was not included.

**Table 3-26. Librarian Involvement in Decision-Making Counts and Estimates for Public Schools: the Library Media Specialist Survey Compared to the Schools and Staffing Survey, 1993-94**

LMS Survey										
Decision Making	Linked Schools <sup>1</sup>						All Schools			
	Team Exists						Team May or May Not Exist			
	Librarian/Administration		Librarian/Faculty		Librarian/Faculty/ Administration		Librarian/Faculty/Administration			
	Counts	Percentages	Counts	Percentages	Counts	Percentages	Counts	Percentages	Estimates	Percentages
Involvement <sup>2</sup>	556	56.7	514	52.4	526	53.7	1,493	67.3	27,730.9	76.8
Noninvolvement	119	12.1	161	16.4	67	6.8	173	7.8	3,062.7	8.5
Nonrespondent <sup>3</sup>	88	9.0	88	9.0	88	9.0	272	12.3	0.0	0.0
Neutral <sup>4</sup>	0	0.0	0	0.0	82	8.4	279	12.6	5,327.8	14.7
Out-of-Scope	217	22.1	217	22.1	217	22.1	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total	980	100.0	980	100.0	980	100.0	2,217	100.0	36,121.5	100.0

  

SASS Survey All Schools				
	Presence of a Decision Making Team <sup>5</sup>			
	Counts	Percentages	Estimates	Percentages
Yes	3,626	41.4	33,764.7	41.8
No <sup>6</sup>	5,141	58.6	46,975.4	58.2
Total In-Scope	8,767	100.0	80,740.1	100.0

Abbreviations:

LMS = Library Media Specialist/Librarian

SASS = Schools and Staffing Survey

Continued on next page

**Table 3-26. Librarian Involvement in Decision-Making Counts and Estimates for Public Schools:  
the Library Media Specialist Survey Compared to the Schools and Staffing Survey, 1993-94 - Continued**

Notes:

1. Linked schools are those that match by identification number between surveys. The schools are on both surveys' mailing list, that is, sample or universe. There were 980 linked schools reporting a decision-making body that brought administrators and teachers together on school resource issues on the SASS survey and linked to the LMS survey.
2. Involvement = Those schools where the librarian reported attitudes that indicated involvement in decision-making.
3. Scope = Scope is the classification of survey units by type of response or nonresponse. For the LMS survey, there are in-scopes, nonrespondents, and out-of-scopes. Nonrespondents are schools with a librarian and reporting at least certain items. Out-of-scopes are cases where there is no librarian. Nonrespondents are a combination of reported data and missing responses; the school has a librarian, but the remainder of the responses are insufficient for inclusion in tabulated data.
4. Neutral = not meeting the criteria for involvement or noninvolvement at this level
5. There are no blank data fields for this item on the SASS survey.
6. There were 3,976 schools that reported no decision-making team. There were 1,165 schools that reported a team, but not one that brought administrators and teachers together.

Source:

1993-94 Library Media Specialist /Librarian Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)  
1993-94 Schools and Staffing Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

*Library Media Specialist Surveys Compared to Other Surveys - continued*

**Section 3.6A LMS and CCD State Nonfiscal Survey (Public): Librarian Definitions**

**Definitions and Items**

*LMS*

- LMS Item 2 = “How do you classify your MAIN assignment at THIS school (i.e., the activity at which you spend MOST of your time) this school year?”
- Check Box 1 = “Itinerant library media specialist/ librarian (i.e., your assignment requires you to provide library media services at more than 1 school)”
- Check Box 2 = “Regular full-time library media specialist/librarian at this school”
- Check Box 3 = “Part-time library media specialist/librarian”
- Check Box 4 = “Long-term substitute library media specialist/librarian (i.e., your assignment requires you fill the role of a regular library media specialist/ librarian on a long-term basis, but you are still considered a substitute)”

*CCD*

- Item C04 (F04) = “ Lib r a r i a n s / M e d i a Specialists”

**Discussion**

For specialists/librarians, the CCD state nonfiscal survey counts and the public school LMS survey estimates can be compared. The LMS survey respondents who indicated the main assignment of a library media specialist/librarian compared to those counted as librarians and media specialists on the CCD state nonfiscal survey. Because the LMS survey counted only the respondent, the CCD state nonfiscal

survey counts for specialists/librarians should equal or exceed the estimates for those reporting on the LMS survey.

The CCD state nonfiscal survey suggested the librarians and media specialists were in charge of books and printed materials. Most libraries have a larger printed collection than audiovisual or computer resources. Also, traditionally the library is a depository of books and other printed materials. Thus, it can be assumed the CCD state nonfiscal survey counts the librarian in a typical library in the specialist/librarian category. (see the comparisons of definitions of personnel under Section 4.0A.)

The LMS survey also indicated the librarian or media specialist was the person in charge of the printed collection. The LMS survey requested the “school employee who is responsible for this school’s library, that is, the library media specialist or librarian” complete the survey. Because there was nothing contradictory in the library definition, tradition would cause the assumption that the librarian or media library specialist was the person in charge of the printed materials if the school had printed, audiovisual and computer resources under different staffs.

For the future, the resources invested in the three areas (print, audiovisual and computer) may change in proportions. If the majority of resources shift to computer and/or audiovisual resources, the CCD state nonfiscal survey counts for librarians and media specialists may decline, and the count for the library and media support staff may increase. The counts for the LMS survey would not be affected.

**Related Report Sections**

See Section 3.6B.

**Section 3.6B LMS and CCD State Nonfiscal Survey (Public): Librarian Estimates**

**Comparison**

The estimates of specialists/librarians for the public school LMS survey and the CCD state nonfiscal survey were compared.

**Hypothesis**

The main difference in counts should be due to the CCD state nonfiscal survey inclusion of all librarians while the LMS survey counts only the librarian.

**Principal Findings:** The reporting between surveys for librarians was generally consistent.

### Tables

Table 3-27 shows the results.

### Items

See Section 3.6A.

### Results in a Nutshell

Expectations were met at the national level and for the majority of states.

### Basic Findings

The expectation that the counts of all librarians on one survey would exceed the counts of respondents on the other survey was met at the national level and for most states. The ratios shown in Table 3-27 ranged from 0.07 to 4.37. The average for the nation was 0.72.

There were a few states where the CCD survey counts exceeded the LMS survey more than expected. This may be due to libraries headed by other professionals, nonprofessionals or volunteers who were counted as librarians/media specialists on the CCD state nonfiscal survey. Another possible explanation lies in the differing presentation of resources (printed, audiovisual or computer) in the library definitions for the CCD survey. See Section 4.0A.

There were 16 states in Table 3-27 for which the estimate from the LMS survey exceeded the CCD state nonfiscal survey's count, the opposite of expectations. Some of this may be differing units of collection or an estimation issue as was indicated by the LMC survey comparison to the CCD surveys.

### Other Findings

#### Estimation

California's report of 928.0 on the CCD state nonfiscal survey appeared to be a data error. California ranked first for all states for the number of specialists/librarians according to the LMS survey data but twenty-fifth per the CCD state nonfiscal survey. California ranked first for this data on both the LMC and the SASS surveys. State rankings are discussed further in Section 5.1.

**Table 3-27. Library Media Specialist/Librarian Estimates for Public Schools:  
The Library Media Specialist Survey Compared to the Common Core of Data State Nonfiscal Survey  
by State, 1993-94**

By Alphabetical State Order				By Descending LMS/CCD Ratio	
	LMS Survey (C1)	CCD Survey (C2)	LMS/CCD (C1/C2)	LMS/CCD (C1/C2)	
United States	36,121.6	50,501.0	0.72	United States	0.72
Alabama	1,122.8	1,194.0	0.94	California	4.37
Alaska	53.9	156.0	0.35	South Dakota	2.51
Arizona	458.0	773.0	0.59	North Dakota	2.10
Arkansas	906.2	948.0	0.96	Montana	1.94
California	4,057.3	928.0	4.37	Idaho	1.82
Colorado	634.5	704.0	0.90	Oklahoma	1.67
Connecticut	131.5	654.0	0.20	Iowa	1.50
Delaware	31.1	116.0	0.27	Wyoming	1.48
District of Columbia	12.7	173.0	0.07	New Mexico	1.47
Florida	757.5	2,513.0	0.30	Maine	1.38
Georgia	731.3	2,053.0	0.36	Utah	1.38
Hawaii	56.0	286.0	0.20	Nebraska	1.34
Idaho	305.1	168.0	1.82	West Virginia	1.25
Illinois	1,573.1	1,973.0	0.80	Mississippi	1.11
Indiana	704.5	1,047.0	0.67	Missouri	1.11
Iowa	980.9	652.0	1.50	Rhode Island	1.03
Kansas	865.4	973.0	0.89	Arkansas	0.96
Kentucky	437.4	1,187.0	0.37	Alabama	0.94
Louisiana	999.5	1,217.0	0.82	Colorado	0.90
Maine	333.7	241.0	1.38	Kansas	0.89
Maryland	170.6	1,078.0	0.16	Louisiana	0.82
Massachusetts	440.9	567.0	0.78	Texas	0.81
Michigan	715.0	1,500.0	0.48	Illinois	0.80
Minnesota	595.7	984.0	0.61	Massachusetts	0.78
Mississippi	711.9	640.0	1.11	New Hampshire	0.74
Missouri	1,401.3	1,261.0	1.11	Tennessee	0.72
Montana	658.3	339.0	1.94	Vermont	0.71
Nebraska	747.6	558.0	1.34	Indiana	0.67
Nevada	105.9	239.0	0.44	North Carolina	0.65
New Hampshire	187.5	254.0	0.74	Minnesota	0.61
New Jersey	382.6	1,800.0	0.21	Wisconsin	0.60
New Mexico	358.3	243.0	1.47	Arizona	0.59
New York	551.0	2,983.0	0.18	Oregon	0.58
North Carolina	1,398.5	2,151.0	0.65	Ohio	0.51
North Dakota	375.5	179.0	2.10	South Carolina	0.48
Ohio	908.7	1,776.0	0.51	Michigan	0.48
Oklahoma	1,433.1	860.0	1.67	Nevada	0.44
Oregon	385.5	665.0	0.58	Washington	0.44
Pennsylvania	786.3	2,170.0	0.36	Virginia	0.38
Rhode Island	84.4	82.0	1.03	Kentucky	0.37
South Carolina	520.1	1,085.0	0.48	Pennsylvania	0.36
South Dakota	523.1	208.0	2.51	Georgia	0.36
Tennessee	924.7	1,280.0	0.72	Alaska	0.35
Texas	3,352.6	4,143.0	0.81	Florida	0.30
Utah	367.9	267.0	1.38	Delaware	0.27
Vermont	141.2	199.0	0.71	New Jersey	0.21
Virginia	738.3	1,945.0	0.38	Connecticut	0.20
Washington	554.7	1,255.0	0.44	Hawaii	0.20
West Virginia	451.5	360.0	1.25	New York	0.18
Wisconsin	796.9	1,339.0	0.60	Maryland	0.16
Wyoming	199.6	135.0	1.48	District of Columbia	0.07

Abbreviations: CCD = Common Core of Data LMS = Library Media Specialist/Librarian

Notes:  
The LMS survey covers the respondent only. The CCD is collected in full-time equivalents.

Source:  
1993-94 Library Media Specialist/Librarian Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)  
1993-94 Common Core of Data State Nonfiscal Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

## CHAPTER 4. LIBRARY STAFF

### *Library Media Center Surveys Compared to Common Core of Data State Nonfiscal Survey*

#### **Section 4.0A LMC and CCD State Nonfiscal Survey (Public): Total Library Staff Definitions:**

##### **Definitions and Items**

###### *LMC*

LMC Item 1a = “How many state-certified library media specialists work in this school’s library media center?”

LMC Item 1b = “How many professional staff members working in this school’s library media center are NOT certified as library media specialists?”

LMC Item 1c = “How many other PAID employees work in this school’s library media center?”

###### *CCD*

##### “Librarians and Media Specialists -

Librarians are those professional staff members and supervisors who are assigned specific duties and school time to professional library service activities, including: selecting, acquiring, preparing, cataloging and circulating books and other printed materials; planning the use of the library by students, teachers and other members of the instructional staff; and guiding individuals in their use of library books and materials, whether maintained separately or as a part of an instructional materials center.”

##### “Library and Media Support Staff -

Library support staff are those staff members who render other professional library services, including selecting, preparing, caring for and making available to members of the instructional staff the equipment, films, filmstrips, transparencies, tapes, television programs and similar materials, whether maintained separately or as part of an instructional materials center.

- INCLUDE activities in the audiovisual center, television studio, and related work-study areas and services provided by audiovisual personnel.
- INCLUDE library aides and those involved in library/media support.”

CCD Item C04 (FO4) = “Librarians/ Media Specialists”

CCD Item C05 (F05) = “Library/Media Support Staff”

##### **Discussion**

Estimates for library staff from the LMC survey can be compared to the universe counts from the CCD state nonfiscal survey. Table 4-1 shows key comparisons of the definitions for library media specialists and other library staff between the LMC survey and the CCD state nonfiscal survey.

The public school LMC survey did not present definitions of personnel. These definitions must be construed from the definition of a library (see Section 2.0A) and the three staff categories requested by the questions.

Table 4-2 shows various ways the CCD state nonfiscal survey library staff definitions could be interpreted based on assumptions made by the respondent:

- Assumption one focused on whether a position was professional or nonprofessional.
- Assumption two focused on materials worked with. The CCD state nonfiscal survey definitions concentrated on identifying the duties and materials used by the staff.
- Assumption three considered all staff to be professional as stated in the CCD state nonfiscal survey definitions. Classification was determined by type of materials worked with.

Sometimes the respondent skips the definitions or forgets them while completing the form. The form

asked for “Librarians/Media Specialists” and “Library/Media Support Staff.” The wording of these two categories, considered on their own, suggested placing other professionals and nonprofessionals working in the library in the support staff category.

There may be differences in estimates due to the units of collection. The CCD state nonfiscal survey collected counts in full-time equivalents. The LMC survey collected librarian counts which were weighted to produce the estimates.

There may be differences in estimates due to the resources mentioned in the definitions. The CCD state nonfiscal survey does not mention computer resource staff in the library staff definitions.

There will be differences in estimates due to the levels of reporting. The CCD state nonfiscal survey respondents were the state coordinators, while the LMC survey respondents were the school staff. Thus, the CCD state nonfiscal survey may include district and regional level media services, while the LMC survey did not.

There may be differences in estimates due to volunteers. The LMC survey separated volunteers, while the CCD survey did not mention them.

The different reporting dates should not matter. The CCD state nonfiscal survey instructed the respondent to report as of October 1. The LMC survey was for the school year. The LMC survey did not specify a date for reporting information. Because schools report positions rather than current staff, however, there should be minimal differences due to timing.

### **Related Report Sections**

See Section 4.0B.

### **Section 4.0B LMC and CCD State Nonfiscal Survey (Public): Total Library Staff Estimates**

#### **Comparison**

Estimates of total library staff were compared between the LMC and CCD state nonfiscal surveys.

#### **Hypothesis**

The LMC survey estimates are expected to be higher primarily due to the different units of collection and inclusion of computer resource staff.

**Principal Findings:** The estimates of total library staff differed between surveys.

#### **Tables**

Table 4-4 shows the results.

#### **Items**

See Section 4.0A.

#### **Results in a Nutshell**

The LMC survey estimates were higher, probably due to the different units of collection and the inclusion of computer resource staff. The magnitude of the differences, however, suggested additional causes such as the levels of reporting or an estimation issue for the LMC survey.

#### **Basic Findings**

In all states, the LMC survey estimate was equal to or higher than the CCD state nonfiscal survey total. The national ratio was 1.59. The LMC survey estimates, however, may be too high. The data suggested that, for thirteen states, more than twice as many library personnel were computer resource personnel than were librarians/specialists, library aides and other professionals. It was unknown how much of the difference was due to different units of collection. Differences also could be due to the levels of reporting or an estimation issue for the LMC survey data.

#### **Other Findings**

##### **Estimation**

For the individual school records on the LMC survey, the schools with the highest weights should report the fewest personnel. (The schools with the highest weights should represent the smaller schools.) This was not always the case.

Example: There were 112 public schools in Massachusetts. The weights ranged from 2.6 to 56.7. Responses ranged from zero to nine. For the three highest weights, two respondents with weights of 56.7 and 56.3 reported a count of three for staff. Also notable, respondents with weights of 36.5, 27.6 and 25.7, reported four, five and three staff members, respectively.

Table 4-1. Key Definition Differences for Library Media Center Staff: The LMC Survey Compared to the CCD State Nonfiscal Survey			
Type of Library Media Center Staff	Key Definitions Features The Public School LMC Survey	Type of Library Media Center Staff	Key Definitions Features The CCD State Nonfiscal Survey
Library media specialist	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>state certified</i></li> <li>• eligible for state certification upon completion of probation</li> </ul>	Librarians and media specialists	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>professionals with specific duties focusing on printed materials</i></li> </ul>
Other professional staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>nonstate-certified library media specialists</i></li> <li>• <i>any professional working in the media center</i></li> </ul>	Library and media support staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>other professionals who focus on audiovisual services</i></li> </ul>
Other paid staff	paid: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>clerical staff</i></li> <li>• <i>library aides</i></li> <li>• <i>other support staff</i></li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>library aides</i></li> <li>• <i>“those involved in library/media support”</i></li> </ul>
Volunteers	unpaid services	Volunteers	not mentioned

Abbreviations:

CCD = Common Core of Data Survey

LEA = Local Education Agency Survey

LMC = Library Media Center Survey

**Table 4-2. Differing Interpretations of Library Media Center Staff Categories for the CCD State Nonfiscal Survey**

**Assumption: The key difference in descriptions is professional training: Librarians and media specialists are professionals; library support staff are nonprofessionals.**

<b>Librarians and Media Specialists</b>	<b>Library and Media Support Staff</b>
Librarians and media specialists with degrees	Librarians and media specialists without degrees
Audiovisual resource staff with degrees	Audiovisual resource staff without degrees
Library aides with (any) degree	Library aides without degrees
	Clerks

**Assumption: The key difference in descriptions is the type of materials worked with: Librarians and media specialists are those working with printed resources; library support staff are those working with audiovisual resources.**

<b>Librarians and Media Specialists</b>	<b>Library and Media Support Staff</b>
Librarians and media specialists, with or without degrees, primarily working with printed materials	Librarians and media specialists, with or without degrees, primarily working with audiovisual resources
Other professionals primarily working with printed materials	Other professionals primarily working with audiovisual resources
Library aides primarily working with printed materials	Library aides primarily working with audiovisual resources
Clerks in the printed materials area	Clerks in the audiovisual area

**Assumption: The staff must be professional for both categories. The break out is determined by the type of materials worked with: Librarians and media specialists are professionals who work with printed materials; library support staff are professionals who work with audiovisual resources.**

<b>Librarians and Media Specialists</b>	<b>Library and Media Support Staff</b>
Librarians and media specialists with degrees primarily working with printed materials	Librarians and media specialists with degrees primarily working with audiovisual resources
Other professionals primarily working with printed materials	Other professionals primarily working with audiovisual resources
Library aides with degrees primarily working printed materials	Library aides with degrees primarily working with audiovisual resources

**Abbreviations:**

CCD = Common Core of Data

**Notes:**

This report assumes that a professional may have an associate, bachelor's, master's or doctoral degree. Note, however, that the American Association of School Librarians and the Association of Educational Communications and Technology consider the master's degree in library and information science and related fields to be the entry-level degree for a professional school librarian.

Note that computer resources are not mentioned by the CCD state nonfiscal survey definitions.

**Table 4-3. Coverage of Library Media Specialists/Librarians' Income: The Library Media Specialist Survey Compared to the National Public Education Financial Survey**

Income	The NPEFS Survey Salaries for Instructional Staff Support Services	The LMS Survey Salaries for Librarians
Library media specialist duties at public schools	Yes	Yes
Library media specialist duties at district or regional level centers	Yes	No
Library media specialists teaching summer school	Yes	Yes
Library media specialists teaching during the school year	No	Yes
Library media specialists earning supplemental income from other duties or jobs within the school	Yes	Yes
Improvement of instruction and other support services (not related to the library media center)	Yes	No

Abbreviations:

LMS = Library Media Specialist/Librarian Survey  
 NPEFS = National Public Education Financial Survey

Note:  
 The NPEFS survey salaries for Instructional Staff Support Services include improvement of instruction, educational media services and other support services.

**Table 4-4. Total Library Media Center Staff Estimates for Public Schools:  
the Library Media Center Survey Compared to  
the Common Core of Data State Nonfiscal Survey by State, 1993-94**

<b>By Alphabetical State Order</b>				<b>By Descending LMC/CCD Ratio</b>	
	<b>LMC Survey</b>	<b>CCD Survey</b>	<b>LMC/CCD</b>	<b>LMC/CCD</b>	
	<b>(C1)</b>	<b>(C2)</b>	<b>(C1/C2)</b>	<b>(C1/C2)</b>	
United States	140,615.7	88,416	1.59	United States	1.59
Alabama	1,902.6	1,365	1.39	South Dakota*	5.28
Alaska	690.5	332	2.08	Oklahoma*	3.55
Arizona	2,031.5	1,390	1.46	Montana	3.11
Arkansas*	1,545.4	948	1.63	Massachusetts	2.94
California	10,943.6	3,950	2.77	California	2.77
Colorado	2,427.1	1,786	1.36	Idaho	2.72
Connecticut	1,562.4	1,307	1.20	North Dakota	2.71
Delaware	227.6	150	1.52	Rhode Island	2.64
District of Columbia	219.0	177	1.24	Nebraska	2.60
Florida	4,583.5	3,218	1.42	Wyoming	2.20
Georgia	3,530.3	3,201	1.10	Alaska	2.08
Hawaii	344.2	352	0.98	Illinois	2.05
Idaho	939.0	345	2.72	Kansas	2.03
Illinois	7,765.8	3,782	2.05	Minnesota	1.95
Indiana	3,448.1	2,470	1.40	Maine	1.95
Iowa	3,200.8	2,006	1.60	Wisconsin	1.94
Kansas	2,932.5	1,442	2.03	West Virginia	1.90
Kentucky	2,345.8	1,659	1.41	Michigan	1.84
Louisiana	1,931.7	1,323	1.46	Washington	1.71
Maine	1,023.6	526	1.95	New Jersey	1.69
Maryland	2,070.6	1,552	1.33	Utah	1.65
Massachusetts	2,522.6	858	2.94	Arkansas*	1.63
Michigan	5,804.7	3,158	1.84	Iowa	1.60
Minnesota	3,446.0	1,763	1.95	Vermont	1.57
Mississippi	1,524.0	1,054	1.45	New York	1.56
Missouri	3,400.0	2,573	1.32	Ohio	1.56
Montana	1,529.4	491	3.11	Delaware	1.52
Nebraska	2,140.7	823	2.60	New Mexico	1.49
Nevada	662.9	476	1.39	Oregon	1.47
New Hampshire	733.6	553	1.33	Arizona	1.46
New Jersey	4,157.3	2,457	1.69	Louisiana	1.46
New Mexico	827.4	554	1.49	Mississippi	1.45
New York	7,295.6	4,672	1.56	Florida	1.42
North Carolina	3,880.5	3,033	1.28	Kentucky	1.41
North Dakota	906.4	335	2.71	Indiana	1.40
Ohio	6,033.5	3,878	1.56	Alabama	1.39
Oklahoma*	3,052.6	860	3.55	Nevada	1.39
Oregon	2,208.5	1,501	1.47	Colorado	1.36
Pennsylvania	5,409.8	4,107	1.32	Maryland	1.33
Rhode Island	480.6	182	2.64	New Hampshire	1.33
South Carolina	2,088.7	1,805	1.16	Missouri	1.32
South Dakota*	1,097.3	208	5.28	Pennsylvania	1.32
Tennessee	2,178.7	2,051	1.06	North Carolina	1.28
Texas	9,988.1	9,100	1.10	District of Columbia	1.24
Utah	1,051.2	637	1.65	Connecticut	1.20
Vermont	585.6	372	1.57	South Carolina	1.16
Virginia	3,130.8	2,895	1.08	Georgia	1.10
Washington	3,404.1	1,990	1.71	Texas	1.10
West Virginia	696.6	366	1.90	Virginia	1.08
Wisconsin	4,013.9	2,066	1.94	Tennessee	1.06
Wyoming	698.8	317	2.20	Hawaii	0.98

Abbreviations: CCD = Common Core of Data LMC = Library Media Center

Notes:  
The CCD state nonfiscal survey collects data in full-time equivalents while the LMC survey collects counts. For this table, library media staff definitions include library media specialists/ librarians, other professionals working in the library, library aides, audiovisual resource staff, and: For the LMC survey, include computer resource staff and clerks. For the CCD survey, include district and regional level media services.

For states marked with an asterisk, the state coordinators indicated that the request for library/ media support staff counts on the CCD state nonfiscal survey was not applicable.

Source:  
1993-94 Library Media Center Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)  
1993-94 Common Core of Data State Nonfiscal Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

*Library Media Center Surveys Compared to Common Core of Data State Nonfiscal Survey - continued*

**Section 4.1A LMC and CCD State Nonfiscal Survey (Public): Other Professional Staff Definitions**

**Definitions and Items**

*LMC*

LMC Item 1b = “How many professional staff members working in this school’s library media center are NOT certified as library media specialists?”

*CCD*

“Library and Media Support Staff -

Library support staff are those staff members who render other professional library services, including selecting, preparing, caring for and making available to members of the instructional staff the equipment, films, filmstrips, transparencies, tapes, television programs and similar materials, whether maintained separately or as part of an instructional materials center.

- INCLUDE activities in the audiovisual center, television studio, and related work-study areas and services provided by audiovisual personnel.
- INCLUDE library aides and those involved in library/media support.”

CCD Item C05 (F05) = “Library/Media Support Staff”

**Discussion**

Other staff at the library may consist of professionals, library aides, television studio staff, computer learning laboratory staff and volunteers. Estimates for other professional staff at the library from the LMC survey were compared to the universe counts of support staff from the CCD state nonfiscal survey.

Other Professional Staff:

The issue was whether librarians were included in the “other professionals” category. The LMC survey “other

professional” staff category included librarians who were not state certified. Whether the CCD state nonfiscal survey included librarians in the library and media support staff category was subject to interpretation.

Under the description for library and media support staff in the CCD state nonfiscal survey, the word “professional” appeared once. It indicated the intent was to collect only professionals. For purposes of comparison, the CCD state nonfiscal survey support staff was assumed to be professional. The two instructions following this paragraph, however, seem to contradict this intent:

- The first instructed the respondent to include “activities” in various areas and “audiovisual personnel,” rather than specific staff and professionals.
- In the second, the description requested the respondent “INCLUDE library aides and those involved in Library/Media support.”

Again, there was no reference to professional training. This instruction also suggested the inclusion of clerks in the library and media support staff count.

Library Aides and Clerks:

Library aides received different treatment in the two surveys. The LMC survey clearly considered library aides and clerks to be nonprofessional staff. This was indicated by a request for state-certified library media specialists, followed by a request for other professionals, and a request for other paid staff which specified the inclusion of paid clerical staff and library aides. The CCD state nonfiscal survey data may or may not have included library aides and clerks as professional support staff as discussed in Section 4.0A.

Television Studio Staff:

The LMC survey asked if the *school* had in-house television production facilities and if the television production was under the supervision of the library media staff. The CCD survey staff definitions assumed the television studio was part of the library. Television studios, whether maintained separately or as part of the instructional materials center, were included as other professional library services for CCD survey staff counts. A school could report the television studio was not under the supervision of the library media staff on

the LMC survey, while the state may report the television studio staff as library media support staff on the CCD survey.

In many schools, television studios are no longer considered a support activity. Television production is a class for credit. Television studios are often located in the vocational-technical area. Thus, schools may or may not consider television staff to be library staff.

On the LMC survey, the respondent reported library staff counts long before reaching the section asking if the television studio was under the supervision of the library media staff. Their thoughts at the time of reporting staff counts may or may not have included the television studio staff. The definition of a library on the LMC survey referenced audiovisual resources but did not specify television studios.

#### Computer Learning Laboratory Staff:

Reporting could vary for computer learning laboratory staff. The definition on the LMC survey included computer resources, thus, computer laboratory personnel were intended to be included with the library. The CCD survey did not reference computer resources. It was up to the respondent to decide whether computer laboratory staff should be reported.

#### Volunteers:

The public school LMC survey requested “other PAID employees [who] work in this school’s library media center,” specified whom to include, and then instructed “Do not include unpaid volunteers.” The CCD survey did not mention volunteers. Because these were counts, not salaries, they may or may not be reported with the CCD survey’s library/media support staff.

#### Related Report Sections

See Section 4.1B.

### **Section 4.1B LMC and CCD State Nonfiscal Survey (Public): Other Professional Staff Estimates**

#### **Comparison**

A comparison of the LMC survey other professional staff in the library to the CCD state nonfiscal survey library and media support staff was done.

#### **Hypothesis**

Differences in estimates of other professional staff are expected due to the differing treatments of librarians, aides, clerks, television studio staff and computer resource staff. Most notably, aides and clerks are specifically excluded from the LMC survey other professional staff but may be included for the CCD state nonfiscal survey support staff. This would cause the LMC survey estimates to be less than the CCD state nonfiscal survey counts. The collection of data in full-time equivalents on the CCD may have an offsetting affect.

**Principal Finding:** The comparison suggested the surveys were collecting these staff counts in the intended categories.

#### **Tables**

See Table 4-5.

#### **Items**

See Section 4.0A.

#### **Results in a Nutshell**

The LMC survey estimates were generally lower than the CCD state nonfiscal survey counts, as expected.

#### **Basic Findings**

For most states, the weighted LMC survey total was notably less than the CCD state nonfiscal survey count. The data indicated the CCD survey could include nonprofessionals and television studio staff in its support staff counts. The ratios ranged from 0.10 to 3.04, except for West Virginia. The national average was 0.52. Removing West Virginia’s ratio of 11.32 from the national totals does not change the national ratio.

## **Other Findings**

### Estimation

West Virginia was a notable outlier on Table 4-6. The ratio of the LMC survey estimate to the CCD state

nonfiscal survey count was 11.32. Both the LMC survey count and the CCD state nonfiscal survey count were six. The CCD estimate was probably an error.

<b>Table 4-5 Other Professional Staff Estimates for Public Schools: The Library Media Center Survey Compared to the Common Core of Data State Nonfiscal Survey by State, 1993-94</b>					
<b>By Alphabetical State Order</b>				<b>By Descending LMC/CCD Ratio</b>	
	<b>LMC Survey</b>	<b>CCD Survey</b>	<b>LMC/CCD</b>	<b>LMC/CCD</b>	
	<b>(C1)</b>	<b>(C2)</b>	<b>(C1/C2)</b>	<b>(C1/C2)</b>	
United States	19,816.4	37,915	0.52	United States	0.52
Alabama	120.7	171	0.71	Arkansas	NA
Alaska	179.6	176	1.02	South Dakota	NA
Arizona	383.7	617	0.62	Oklahoma	NA
Arkansas	154.9	NA	NA	West Virginia	11.32
California	4,321.0	3,022	1.43	District of Columbia	3.04
Colorado	697.9	1,082	0.64	Louisiana	2.49
Connecticut	65.1	653	0.10	Idaho	1.61
Delaware	24.2	34	0.71	California	1.43
District of Columbia	12.2	4	3.04	Montana	1.35
Florida	326.3	705	0.46	Massachusetts	1.10
Georgia	391.1	1,148	0.34	Alaska	1.02
Hawaii	27.5	66	0.42	North Dakota	0.90
Idaho	285.2	177	1.61	Nebraska	0.88
Illinois	1,444.5	1,809	0.80	Michigan	0.80
Indiana	526.6	1,423	0.37	Illinois	0.80
Iowa	534.5	1,354	0.39	Kansas	0.79
Kansas	369.3	469	0.79	Maine	0.73
Kentucky	206.6	472	0.44	Delaware	0.71
Louisiana	264.2	106	2.49	Alabama	0.71
Maine	209.4	285	0.73	Washington	0.69
Maryland	102.8	474	0.22	Nevada	0.66
Massachusetts	320.4	291	1.10	New Mexico	0.65
Michigan	1,326.2	1,658	0.80	Utah	0.65
Minnesota	336.9	779	0.43	Colorado	0.64
Mississippi	241.6	414	0.58	Arizona	0.62
Missouri	505.8	1,312	0.39	Wyoming	0.60
Montana	205.1	152	1.35	Mississippi	0.58
Nebraska	232.3	265	0.88	Oregon	0.58
Nevada	156.5	237	0.66	Ohio	0.57
New Hampshire	113.9	299	0.38	Vermont	0.56
New Jersey	196.8	657	0.30	Wisconsin	0.49
New Mexico	203.6	311	0.65	Florida	0.46
New York	270.1	1,689	0.16	North Carolina	0.45
North Carolina	395.2	882	0.45	Kentucky	0.44
North Dakota	140.6	156	0.90	Minnesota	0.43
Ohio	1,197.3	2,102	0.57	Hawaii	0.42
Oklahoma	635.7	NA	NA	Iowa	0.39
Oregon	487.4	836	0.58	Missouri	0.39
Pennsylvania	334.0	1,937	0.17	New Hampshire	0.38
Rhode Island	30.2	100	0.30	Indiana	0.37
South Carolina	122.6	720	0.17	Georgia	0.34
South Dakota	214.4	NA	NA	Rhode Island	0.30
Tennessee	111.9	771	0.15	New Jersey	0.30
Texas	830.1	4,957	0.17	Maryland	0.22
Utah	239.4	370	0.65	Virginia	0.20
Vermont	96.3	173	0.56	Pennsylvania	0.17
Virginia	190.1	950	0.20	South Carolina	0.17
Washington	506.8	735	0.69	Texas	0.17
West Virginia	67.9	6	11.32	New York	0.16
Wisconsin	356.0	727	0.49	Tennessee	0.15
Wyoming	109.0	182	0.60	Connecticut	0.10

Abbreviations:

CCD = Common Core of Data

LMC = Library Media Center

NA = Not available or not applicable

Notes:

The CCD state nonfiscal survey collects data in full-time equivalents while the LMC survey collects counts. For this table, other professionals include those working with audiovisual: For the LMC survey, include those working with computer resources. For the CCD survey, include district and regional level media services.

United States total excludes states where data for the CCD survey are not available.

Source:

1993-94 Library Media Center Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

1993-94 Common Core of Data State Nonfiscal Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

*Library Media Specialist Surveys Compared to National Public Education Financial Survey*

**Section 4.2A LMS and NPEFS Survey (Public): Library Staff Salary Definitions**

**Definitions and Items**

*LMS*

earnings during the summer of 1993 from:

“working as a library media specialist/librarian in this or any other school” (Item 26a1)

“teaching summer school in this or any other school” (Item 26a2)

“working at some other job in a school (e.g., secretary, day care aide)” (Item 26a3)

and during the current school year from:

“...academic year base salary for working in this school system” (Item 26b1)

“...additional compensation from this school system for extracurricular or additional activities such as coaching, student activity sponsorship, or evening classes” (Item 26b2)

*NPEFS*

NPEFS Item 100 for Subfunction 2200: Salaries for instructional staff support services

**Discussion**

The LMS survey collected salaries for librarians. The NPEFS survey collected a state total for “Instructional Staff Support Services” which included specialists/librarians. The weighted salaries for librarians could be roughly compared to the state and national “Instructional Staff Support Services” salaries.

The comparison was tenuous. The NPEFS survey was a universe collection of salaries for improvement of instruction and other support services in addition to educational media services. The LMS survey was a small sample collecting salaries for only respondents.

The NPEFS survey used the term “educational media services,” under instructional staff support services, to

include “school libraries, audiovisual services, educational television, computer-assisted instruction, supervision of educational media services, and other educational media services.” This scope of resources equated to those in the LMS survey library definition, which included: “printed and/or audiovisual and/or computer resources.” Table 4-3 summarizes the inclusions and exclusions to be considered when comparing the LMS survey’s salaries to the NPEFS survey’s support services salaries.

Note the television studio and computer laboratory will be reported under instructional staff support services for the NPEFS survey regardless of who administers the areas. For the LMS survey, these areas were excluded if administered by other than the library staff.

**Applicable Report Sections**

See Section 4.2B.

**Section 4.2B LMS and NPEFS Surveys (Public): Library Staff Salary Estimates:**

**Comparison**

The weighted LMS survey salaries were compared to the NPEFS survey salaries by state.

**Hypothesis**

The NPEFS survey salaries are expected to be higher than the LMS survey salaries. The LMS survey covers only the respondent. The NPEFS data include all library staff, staff salaries for improvement of instruction and other support services, and district and regional level salaries for these functions.

**Principal Findings:** The reporting between the surveys for librarian salaries was highly consistent for most states.

**Tables**

Table 4-6 shows the comparison results.

**Items**

See Section 4.2A.

**Results in a Nutshell**

Expectations were met nationally and for most states.

### **Basic Findings**

Table 4-7 shows that for most states the ratio of LMS survey salaries to NPEFS survey salaries was low, as expected. State ratios ranged from 0.02 to 3.90 and the national ratio was 0.14.

There were a few states where the ratios were the opposite of the expected. The LMS survey salaries may be higher than the NPEFS survey salaries for some

states due to the handling of income for teaching during the school year. On the NPEFS survey, teaching income was reported under a different function than librarian income. The NPEFS requested that the salaries of staff who serve in more than one capacity be distributed among the appropriate functions. For example, the salary of a library media specialist who also taught during the school year would be reported under the functions “instruction” and “support services.” For the LMS survey, any teaching income during the school year was included in and inseparable from the basic salary.

### **Other Findings**

Arkansas was a notable outlier. A specific cause could not be identified, although an error in the LMS data was probable.

**Table 4-6. Library Staff Salary Estimates for Public Schools:  
The Library Media Specialist Survey Compared to the National Public Education Financial Survey by  
State, 1993-94**

<b>By Alphabetical State Order</b>				<b>By Descending LMS/NPEFS Ratio</b>	
	<b>LMS Survey</b>	<b>NPEFS Survey</b>	<b>LMS/NPEFS</b>	<b>LMS/NPEFS</b>	
	<b>(C1)</b>	<b>(C2)</b>	<b>(C1/C2)</b>	<b>(C1/C2)</b>	
United States	672,185,925	4,652,465,917	0.14	United States	0.14
Alabama	32,211,840	59,391,739	0.54	Georgia	NA
Alaska	1,035,538	NA	NA	Oklahoma	NA
Arizona	12,151,262	NA	NA	Pennsylvania	NA
Arkansas	23,492,435	6,030,344	3.90	Massachusetts	NA
California	62,877,834	704,092,741	0.09	Illinois	NA
Colorado	14,561,469	66,012,050	0.22	New Mexico	NA
Connecticut	2,618,790	74,085,806	0.04	Arizona	NA
Delaware	817,057	6,346,169	0.13	Alaska	NA
District of Columbia	365,804	23,197,266	0.02	Tennessee	NA
Florida	21,050,443	366,619,868	0.06	Wisconsin	NA
Georgia	19,875,843	NA	NA	Arkansas	3.90
Hawaii	1,635,021	31,619,750	0.05	North Dakota	1.22
Idaho	6,183,743	14,793,473	0.42	Montana	1.00
Illinois	38,416,072	NA	NA	South Dakota	0.85
Indiana	14,628,663	87,709,610	0.17	Nebraska	0.58
Iowa	22,075,202	127,397,292	0.17	Alabama	0.54
Kansas	23,813,917	55,304,055	0.43	Wyoming	0.53
Kentucky	11,163,158	69,150,039	0.16	Mississippi	0.48
Louisiana	25,081,813	93,880,018	0.27	Kansas	0.43
Maine	7,633,556	22,138,459	0.34	Idaho	0.42
Maryland	4,714,806	135,619,207	0.03	West Virginia	0.42
Massachusetts	9,693,271	NA	NA	Maine	0.34
Michigan	13,925,760	269,502,344	0.05	Missouri	0.34
Minnesota	15,079,962	125,203,138	0.12	North Carolina	0.29
Mississippi	17,419,343	36,645,783	0.48	New Hampshire	0.28
Missouri	33,418,410	98,748,684	0.34	Louisiana	0.27
Montana	15,142,750	15,195,175	1.00	Utah	0.23
Nebraska	17,481,512	30,263,604	0.58	Vermont	0.22
Nevada	2,315,692	20,677,712	0.11	Colorado	0.22
New Hampshire	4,514,908	16,072,262	0.28	Texas	0.19
New Jersey	8,976,393	238,271,131	0.04	Iowa	0.17
New Mexico	7,841,709	NA	NA	Indiana	0.17
New York	15,890,090	304,014,651	0.05	Kentucky	0.16
North Carolina	37,846,364	132,116,027	0.29	South Carolina	0.15
North Dakota	7,345,299	6,014,374	1.22	Delaware	0.13
Ohio	18,061,769	294,187,908	0.06	Minnesota	0.12
Oklahoma	37,944,770	NA	NA	Virginia	0.12
Oregon	8,330,667	72,764,824	0.11	Oregon	0.11
Pennsylvania	22,086,896	NA	NA	Nevada	0.11
Rhode Island	2,297,213	24,368,262	0.09	Rhode Island	0.09
South Carolina	15,103,997	97,661,536	0.15	Washington	0.09
South Dakota	10,567,720	12,403,041	0.85	California	0.09
Tennessee	24,829,936	NA	NA	Ohio	0.06
Texas	91,680,970	493,913,393	0.19	Florida	0.06
Utah	7,910,265	33,864,330	0.23	New York	0.05
Vermont	2,388,308	10,742,576	0.22	Hawaii	0.05
Virginia	22,105,988	190,604,796	0.12	Michigan	0.05
Washington	13,973,582	151,051,990	0.09	New Jersey	0.04
West Virginia	10,979,468	26,268,396	0.42	Connecticut	0.04
Wisconsin	20,263,619	NA	NA	Maryland	0.03
Wyoming	4,503,945	8,522,094	0.53	District of Columbia	0.02

Abbreviations:

LMS = Library Media Specialist/Librarian NA = Not available

NPEFS = National Public Education Financial Survey

Notes:

For this table, salaries cover: For the LMS survey, only the respondent. For the NPEFS survey, all library staff, staff salaries for improvement of instruction and other support services, and district and regional level salaries for these functions.

United States totals exclude states where data for the NPEFS survey are not available.

Source:

1993-94 Library Media Specialist/Librarian Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)  
1993-94 National Public Education Financial Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

## CHAPTER 5. SUMMARY COMPARISONS

### Section 5.0 Drawing Conclusions from the LMS Surveys Librarian Data

#### Comparison

In this report, the LMS survey was compared to the LMC, SASS and CCD state nonfiscal surveys for:

counts of state-certified specialists (LMC), professionals (LMC) and specialists/librarians (CCD),

the classification of the librarian's main assignment (SASS), and

the librarian's role in decision making (SASS).

This section pulled the results from these data comparisons together and drew general conclusions about the usefulness of the LMS survey data.

#### Hypothesis

The LMS survey covered a sample of respondents only. The data should be useful for determining the role of librarians only, not all library staff.

**Principal Findings:** The LMS survey was useful for drawing conclusions about the role of librarians in schools. It was not useful for drawing inferences about all library staff or how one state's librarians compared to another state's.

#### Results in a Nutshell

The LMS survey data were useful for drawing conclusions about the role of librarians in schools. The data were not useful for drawing conclusions about all library staff (specialists/librarians, other professionals, library aides, clerks) or how one state's librarians compared to another state's.

#### Basic Findings

To place the surveys in perspective, it is useful to note that the librarians reporting on the LMS survey represent approximately 3.9 percent of the total universe of librarians. Appendix F gives a sense of the magnitude of the counts from the LMS survey

compared to the LMC, SASS and CCD state nonfiscal surveys counts.

#### Intersurvey Agreement

There was high agreement between the LMS and LMC surveys (Chapter 3, Sections 3.0B and 3.0C) and between the LMS and CCD state nonfiscal surveys (Section 3.6B). Between the LMS and SASS surveys, approximately 69 percent of the public and BIA schools' classifications of main assignment agreed (Section 3.4B). For librarian involvement in decision making, over half of the responses clearly agreed (Section 3.5B). Thus, the LMS survey information concerning the librarian's role in the school was reliable and could be used to draw conclusions for all librarians.

#### Intersurvey Disagreement

The states were ranked by the key variables, library media centers and specialists/librarians, across surveys in Section 5.1. The LMS survey state rankings were found to have no correlation to the other surveys' (LMC, SASS, CCD and TDS) rankings. This was possibly due to the small sample size. The LMS survey data were unlikely to yield useful conclusions for comparisons between states.

### Section 5.1 States Ranked by Key Variables for Public Schools Across Surveys

#### Comparison

The states were ranked by two key variables, library counts and library media specialist/librarian counts, for public schools across surveys. The states were ranked by the LMC survey and the SASS survey library estimates. The states also were ranked by library media specialist/librarian estimates for the LMC survey, the SASS survey, the CCD state nonfiscal survey, the SASS TDS survey and the LMS survey.

#### Hypothesis

States should carry the same rank for the two variables across surveys.

**Principal Findings:** A comparison of state rankings for two key variables found the level of response (librarian, school, local education agency or state) made a difference.

## Tables

See Table 5-1.

## Results in a Nutshell

The level of response (librarian, school, local education agency or state) was the overriding factor for the consistency of data collection. The LMS survey did not show high agreement with the other surveys. The LMC survey and the SASS survey state rankings showed high agreement with each other for both key variables. The CCD state nonfiscal survey and the TDS survey showed high agreement with each other.

## Basic Findings

The LMS survey was conducted at the librarian level. The LMC survey and the SASS survey data were collected at the school level. The CCD survey and the TDS survey were conducted at the state and local education agency level, respectively. These observations indicated the level of data collection (librarian, school, local education agency or state) was related to the consistency of reported data.

The LMS survey state rankings were not generally consistent with the other surveys. No discernable pattern was found. An LMS survey state rank may have agreed with the other survey state rankings, such as for Texas. Or, a state rank may have highly disagreed with all of the other survey state rankings, such as for New York. Or, a state rank may have agreed with the LMC and SASS surveys rankings, but disagreed with the CCD and TDS surveys, such as for Virginia. Or, a state rank may have agreed with the CCD and TDS surveys rankings, but disagreed with the LMC and SASS surveys, such as for Ohio.

The LMC and SASS surveys were highly consistent with each other for estimates of libraries and library media specialists. For example, the top five states for estimates of centers were California, Texas, New York, Illinois and Ohio. Also, the rankings for the two surveys for centers and specialists were similar. That is, a state held a similar ranking for libraries for the LMC survey, libraries for the SASS survey, specialists for the LMC survey, and specialists for the SASS survey. California, for example, ranked first for centers on both the LMC and SASS surveys, first for specialists on the LMC survey, and second for specialists on the SASS survey. Louisiana, Hawaii and Rhode Island carried the same rank across all four of these measures.

The CCD and TDS surveys showed high consistency with each other for counts of specialists. They showed, however, high variability compared with the LMC and SASS surveys. For example, Ohio ranked fourth or fifth for the LMC and SASS surveys, but tenth for the CCD survey and eleventh for the TDS survey. Florida ranked seventh or eighth for the LMC and SASS surveys, but third for both the CCD and TDS surveys. Numerous other states showed a similar reporting pattern: Alabama, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee and Virginia.

Note that the states with the smallest estimates for number of libraries and specialists/librarians were the most consistently ranked across all surveys.

## Other Findings

### Estimation

California was notable: The CCD and TDS surveys placed the state at twenty-fifth and tenth, respectively, while the LMC and SASS surveys placed it at first or second. This analysis readily points out the error or omission in California's reporting (see Sections 3.2B and 3.6B).

**Table 5-1. States Ranked Across Surveys by Key Variables for Public Schools: The Library Media Center Survey, the Library Media Specialist Survey, the Common Core of Data State Nonfiscal Survey, the Schools and Staffing Survey, and the Schools and Staffing Survey Teacher Demand Survey, 1993-94**

State	Library Estimates		Specialist/Librarian Estimates				
	LMC	SASS	LMC	SASS	CCD	TDS	LMS
California	1	1	1	2	25	10	1
Texas	2	2	2	1	1	1	2
New York	3	3	4	3	2	2	27
Illinois	4	4	3	5	7	7	3
Ohio	5	5	5	4	10	11	11
Michigan	6	7	7	8	11	15	20
Pennsylvania	7	6	6	6	4	4	15
Florida	8	8	8	7	3	3	16
Missouri	9	10	9	11	14	16	5
New Jersey	10	9	11	9	9	8	35
Wisconsin	11	11	13	12	12	14	14
North Carolina	12	12	10	10	5	5	6
Indiana	13	13	15	14	21	19	22
Washington	14	15	19	16	15	13	26
Georgia	15	14	12	13	6	6	19
Oklahoma	16	16	14	17	26	23	4
Virginia	17	17	16	15	8	9	18
Tennessee	18	20	22	18	13	12	10
Massachusetts	19	19	24	24	33	28	32
Iowa	20	18	17	21	31	29	9
Kansas	21	22	18	20	23	24	13
Minnesota	22	21	20	19	22	27	25
Louisiana	23	23	23	23	16	20	8
Kentucky	24	25	21	22	18	18	33
Colorado	25	24	25	27	28	32	24
Nebraska	26	26	32	31	34	33	17
Alabama	27	27	26	26	17	17	7
Maryland	28	28	27	25	20	22	43
Oregon	29	29	28	32	29	34	34
South Carolina	30	31	29	28	19	21	29
Arkansas	31	30	30	29	24	26	12
Arizona	32	32	31	30	27	25	30
Connecticut	33	33	36	34	30	30	45
Montana	34	35	33	35	36	36	23
Mississippi	35	34	34	33	32	31	21
West Virginia	36	36	38	36	35	35	31
South Dakota	37	39	35	37	43	46	28
Maine	38	37	41	42	41	38	39
New Mexico	39	40	42	39	40	41	38
Utah	40	38	37	38	38	37	37
Idaho	41	41	39	41	47	47	40
North Dakota	42	42	40	40	45	42	36
Alaska	43	43	44	45	48	48	49
New Hampshire	44	44	45	43	39	43	42
Wyoming	45	45	46	47	49	49	41
Nevada	46	46	43	44	42	44	46
Vermont	47	47	47	46	44	40	44
Rhode Island	48	48	48	48	51	45	47
Hawaii	49	49	49	49	37	39	48
Delaware	50	50	51	50	50	50	50
District of Columbia	51	51	50	51	46	51	51

Abbreviations: CCD = Common Core of Data LMC = Library Media Centers LMS = Library Media Specialist/Librarian  
SASS = Schools and Staffing Survey TDS = Teacher Demand Survey

Notes:

For this table, the LMC survey estimates include other professionals working in the library media center.

The LMS survey covers the respondent only. The CCD collects in full-time equivalents.

Source:

1993-94 Common Core of Data State Nonfiscal data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

1993-94 Library Media Center Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

1993-94 Library Media Specialist/Librarian Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

1993-94 Schools and Staffing Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

## Appendix A. Discussion of Principal Findings with Qualifications

There were three primary objectives for this evaluation of the school library statistical programs. These are listed below, along with a summary of the data analysis and statistical findings for each.

### **Objective: To determine the accuracy of the data representing the numbers of schools with library media centers.**

1. The linked<sup>32</sup> schools counts of libraries from the LMC and the SASS surveys were compared by scope<sup>33</sup> for the public, private and BIA schools, separately. For linked schools, there was a high rate of intersurvey agreement for all three types of schools (public, private and BIA). Direct disagreement between the linked schools was nonexistent for the public and BIA schools. There was little disagreement for the private schools. The linked data suggested the presence or absence of a definition for the library made little difference.
2. The state estimates of libraries from the LMC and the SASS surveys were compared for the public and BIA schools, separately. The state estimates were in high agreement for schools reporting a library. For schools reporting no library, the LMC

---

<sup>32</sup>Linked schools were those matching by identification number between surveys. The schools were on both surveys' mailing lists, that is, sample.

<sup>33</sup>For the LMC and LMS surveys, there were in-scopes, nonrespondents and out-of-scopes. For the LMC survey, in-scopes were schools with libraries and reporting at least certain items. For the LMS survey, in-scopes were schools with a library media specialist/librarian and reporting at least certain items. Out-of-scopes were cases where there was no school or no library, or for the LMS survey, no librarian. If the school did not meet the criteria for in-scope or out-of-scope, then it was classified as a nonrespondent. Nonrespondents were nonrespondents and those that returned a combination of reported data and missing responses. That is, the school had a library or librarian, but the remainder of the survey responses were insufficient for inclusion in the tabulated data.

Out-of-scope cases had weights greater than zero if the school reported no library. Otherwise, out-of-scope cases had weights equal to zero. Nonrespondent cases had no weights, that is, zero for the weight. See Appendices B and C.

survey national estimates were notably lower than the SASS survey national estimates. While the linked data suggested the presence or absence of a definition for the library makes little difference, the weighted data indicated some confusion.

### **Objective: To determine the accuracy of the data concerning the levels at which library media centers are staffed.**

3. Reports of state certification for specialists and professional training for library staff members were compared between in-scope linked schools for the LMC and the LMS surveys for the public, private and BIA schools, separately. The results were inconclusive<sup>34</sup>. The rates of agreement and disagreement were similar for state certification and professional training.

These items were presented in different formats. Differences in response were due more to the way the respondents go about completing the form, rather than a definitional or layout problem.

4. The classification of the specialist/librarian's main assignment was compared between the LMS and the SASS surveys for public, private and BIA schools, separately. Scope was taken into account. There was fairly consistent agreement in reporting for full-time librarians between surveys for public and BIA schools. There was a notable number of part-time specialists/librarians on the LMS survey reported as full time on the SASS survey for all types of schools.
5. Counts and estimates of specialists/librarians were compared between the LMC and the SASS surveys by type of school. Scope was taken into account for the counts. The LMC survey counts and estimates were higher than the SASS survey counts and estimates. The lack of instructions on the LMC survey for reporting counts of staff with more than one function or shared between schools may be a reason. The comparison for library aides generated mixed results.

---

<sup>34</sup>That is, no definite conclusions can be made about the data. The levels of agreement and disagreement were not high enough to declare clear results without input from data users to establish criteria.

6. Estimates for the LMC survey and the CCD state nonfiscal survey were compared for the total library staff for public schools. The LMC survey estimates were higher due to the differing units of collection and possibly the inclusion of computer resource staff and clerks. The magnitude of the differences, however, suggested either the data were affected by the differences in units of reporting, or there may be an estimation issue for the LMC survey.
  7. Estimates of library media specialists were compared between the LMC survey and the CCD state nonfiscal survey for public schools. The LMC survey estimates were higher. The condition may be due to the following:
    - the different units of collection
    - various possible interpretations of the CCD state nonfiscal survey definitions
    - misreporting on the LMC survey
    - the LMC survey estimation
  8. Estimates of other professional staff were compared between the LMC survey and the CCD state nonfiscal survey for public schools. The surveys have differing treatments of librarians, aides, clerks, television studios and computer resources. The fact that aides and clerks were specifically excluded from the LMC survey “other professional staff category,” but included in the CCD state nonfiscal survey “support staff category,” was considered to be the main factor. This factor caused the LMC survey estimates to be generally lower than the CCD state nonfiscal survey estimates.
  9. Estimates of library media specialists/librarians were compared between the LMS survey and the CCD state nonfiscal survey for public schools. It was hypothesized that the nonfiscal CCD surveys counts would be higher than the LMS survey estimates because the LMS survey covers only the respondent. Expectations were met at the national level and for the majority of states. Different units of collection, ambiguous CCD state nonfiscal survey definitions, and the small size of LMS survey sample were potential causes of the cases where expectations were not met.
  10. Estimates for full-time and part-time specialists/librarians were compared between the LMS and SASS surveys for public and BIA schools, separately. The SASS survey estimates were higher primarily because the LMS survey covers only the respondent. The reporting was consistent across types of surveys.
  11. Salary estimates were compared between the LMS and the NPEFS surveys for public schools. It was hypothesized that the NPEFS survey salaries would be higher because the LMS survey covers only the respondent and the NPEFS data include salaries for all educational media services, improvement of instruction, and other support services. Expectations were met nationally and for most states.
  12. Estimates of specialists/librarians were compared between the LMC survey and the SASS TDS survey for public schools. This may be due to the different units of collection. Also, the data may indicate many professionals who were not specialists/librarians were working in the library. The estimation of the LMC survey also may be a factor.
- Objective: To determine the accuracy of the data revealing the role that library media centers and their staff play in schools.**
13. Data from the LMS survey and the SASS survey were compared for public schools. Scope was taken into account. For schools reporting a decision-making body that brings administrators and teachers together, more than half of the specialists/librarians were included in decision making according to the LMS survey. It is interesting to note that the percentage of librarians who feel included in decision making was higher for all schools (with or without a decision-making team) than for those with a decision-making team.
  14. The LMS survey was compared to the LMC, SASS and CCD surveys for counts of state-certified specialists (LMC), professionals (LMC) and specialists/librarians (CCD); the classification of the librarians main assignment (SASS); and the librarians role in decision making (SASS). The results from these comparisons were analyzed and general conclusions were drawn.

The LMS survey was useful for drawing conclusions about the role of librarians in schools. It was not useful for drawing inferences about all library staff or how one state's librarians compare to another state's.

15. The states were ranked by two key variables, library media center counts and library media specialist/librarian counts, for public schools across surveys. The states were ranked by the LMC survey and the SASS survey library estimates. The states also were ranked by specialists/librarians estimates for the LMC survey, the SASS survey, the CCD state nonfiscal survey, the SASS TDS survey and the LMS survey.

The LMS survey did not show high agreement with the other surveys. The LMC survey and the SASS survey state rankings showed high agreement with each other for both key variables. The CCD survey and the TDS survey showed high agreement with each other. The LMS survey was conducted at the respondent level. The LMC survey and the SASS survey data were collected at the school level. The CCD survey and the TDS survey were conducted at the state and local education agency level, respectively. These observations indicated the level of data collection (librarian, school, local education agency or state) was related to the consistency of reported data.

## **Appendix B. Description of Methodology**

### *Project Definition*

The NCES staff was consulted and the report, "School Library Media Centers in the United States, 1990–91," published by the NCES, was reviewed to determine the objectives of the evaluation.

Secondary surveys were selected for inclusion in the project for comparative purposes.

A general data comparison/analysis plan noting materials, schedule and output was created.

A chart of the surveys and their interrelationships was created. The chart noted such items as type of entity, respondent, levels of data summary, and status as a sample or universe.

It was determined there were three basic types of comparisons: definitions, counts for linked schools, and estimates for states and the nation.

### *Evaluation of Survey Definitions*

A list of comparable data items and levels of data summary was created.

The following data elements were examined: libraries; total library staff; specialists/librarians; other professionals working in the library; library aides; salaries for specialists/librarians; and the specialists/librarians' roles in decision making. For specialists/librarians, state certification, professional training and classification of main assignment were examined. Full-time and part-time status of the library staff also was studied.

Observations about the similarities and differences between surveys for terminology, definitions, instructions and item presentations were noted. Hypotheses were documented. Limitations of the comparisons were noted.

### *Data Comparison*

The data files were gathered. The files were imported from various formats into a database format (Microsoft Access). Logic for the data comparisons was created. The data comparisons were performed using queries in Microsoft Access. Findings from the data comparisons

were documented. Tables were created in spreadsheet software (Quattro Pro) showing basic findings.

For the LMC, LMS and SASS surveys, individual school records were available in the data files. The records were linked between survey files by school identification numbers. This enabled direct comparison of reported data at the school level between the LMC and LMS surveys, between the LMC and SASS surveys, and between the LMS and SASS surveys. The comparisons were performed separately for public, private and BIA schools. Based on the analysis of definitions, the most similar data items were compared. Each school's scope was included in the comparisons.

Data files for the CCD state nonfiscal survey and the SASS TDS survey contained state tabulations for public schools only. Data files for the LMC, LMS and SASS surveys contained individual records for public and BIA schools. The school records were weighted and tabulated by state and type of school for the comparisons. Comparisons were made by linking state totals between the LMC and CCD surveys; the LMS and CCD surveys; the LMC and SASS surveys; and the LMS and SASS surveys.

### *Evaluation of Findings*

The findings were examined from different perspectives, and text was created to present the analysis. The relationship of findings to the assessment of definitions was noted. For the linked schools, intersurvey item agreement and disagreement were given special attention.

Sometimes additional queries were run to learn more about the original data comparisons.

The report was reviewed to see how findings between surveys related to findings between other surveys. For example, the LMC survey/ SASS survey findings for individual schools were compared to the LMC survey/SASS survey state-level findings.

How findings at one level related to findings at another level was examined. For the state aggregate tables, state data were ranked from largest to smallest for each survey in the comparison. A few notable differences were referenced in this report. From this exercise, it was decided to create a table showing state rankings for key variables for each public school survey.

### *Scope, Estimation and Imputation*

Survey documentation on scope, estimation and imputation was reviewed. Sections describing the effects of scope, imputation, estimation and outliers were added.

For the linked schools, data comparisons were run to account for scope. Scope was accounted for in findings and tables.

Where linked schools' data between surveys were contradictory, imputation was examined. Imputation was traced to see the effect on the data and to see if the imputation was accomplishing the intended results.

For state aggregate data, the effect of individual school's weights on the data was assessed. State outliers were examined.

#### *Format*

A format was created for presenting linked school findings and evaluation. The relationship of findings to definitions was presented. The surveys and items

compared, and the scopes were described. The hypothesis, results, basic findings, intersurvey agreement and intersurvey disagreement were presented for all comparisons. Scope and imputation analysis followed if applicable.

A similar format was created for presenting state aggregate findings and evaluation. The surveys and items compared were described. The hypothesis and results were listed along with the findings, including relationships of findings to definitions. A discussion of estimation and outliers completed each comparison.

#### *Report Development*

Finalizing the report included:

- writing up a survey of findings and recommendations
- evaluating the LMC and LMS surveys for form design improvements
- incorporating comments from the sponsor, mathematical statisticians and survey analysts

### Appendix C. Sampling for the SASS, LMC and LMS Surveys

- I. SASS Survey public school sampling
  - A. Universe: CCD survey public schools
  - B. Strata
    - 1. Type of school (BIA; schools with 19.5 percent or more Native American students; DE, NV and WV; other)
    - 2. Geographical area
      - a. State or a specific group of states
      - b. Local education agency for DE, NV and WV
    - 3. Grade level (elementary, secondary, combined)
  - C. Sort within each stratum (except BIA schools)
    - 1. State
    - 2. MSA versus Non-MSA
    - 3. Local education agency zip code
    - 4. Local education agency identification number
    - 5. Highest grade
    - 6. School percent minority
    - 7. School enrollment
    - 8. CCD survey school identification number
  - D. Sample within each stratum (except BIA schools)
    - By size ( square root of the number of teachers times the school's basic weight)

#### Abbreviations:

- BIA = Bureau of Indian Affairs
- CCD = Common Core of Data
- DE = Delaware
- LMC = Library Media Center
- LMS = Library Media Specialist/Librarian
- MSA = Metropolitan Statistical Area
- NV = Nevada
- SASS = Schools and Staffing Survey
- WV = West Virginia

#### Notes:

All BIA schools were included in the sample.

## Appendix C. Sampling for the SASS, LMC and LMS Surveys—continued

### II. SASS private school sampling

A. Universe: private schools

B. Frame: Area

1. Strata

- a. Primary sampling unit<sup>2</sup>
- b. Metro versus nonmetro
- c. Enrollment compared to median

C. Frame: School list

1. Strata

- a. School affiliation
- b. Grade level (elementary, secondary, combined)
- c. Region

2. Sort within each stratum

- a. State
- b. Highest grade
- c. Urbanicity
- d. Zip code
- e. School enrollment
- f. School identification number

3. Sample within each stratum

By size (square root of the number of teachers times the school's basic weight)

Notes:

All schools in the area frame were include in the sample.

Each consists of a single county, city or cluster of geographically contiguous counties or cities defined so each unit had a minimum population of 20,000. To avoid covering too large an area, some units had less than 20,000 in population.

## Appendix C. Sampling for the SASS, LMC and LMS Surveys—continued

### III. LMC and LMS survey public school sampling

- A. Universe: SASS survey public school sample
- B. Strata
  - 1. NonBIA schools
    - a. State
    - b. Grade level (elementary, secondary, combined)
  - 2. BIA schools (All are certainty cases.)
- C. Sort within each stratum (except BIA schools)
  - 1. MSA versus Non-MSA
  - 2. Local education agency identification number
  - 3. School enrollment
  - 4. CCD survey identification number
- D. Sample within each stratum (except BIA schools)
  - By size (square root of the number of teachers times the school's basic weight)

### IV. LMC and LMS survey private school sampling

- A. Universe: SASS survey private school sample
- B. Strata
  - 1. School affiliation
  - 2. Grade level
  - 3. Urbanicity
- C. Sort within each stratum
  - 1. Frame (school affiliation list, primary sampling unit)
  - 2. School enrollment
- D. Sample within each stratum
  - By size (square root of the number of teachers times the school's basic weight)

## Appendix D. Scope for the LMC and LMS Surveys -- Counts

### *Definition of Scope*

Tables 1-3, 1-4 and 1-5 show counts and estimates for in-scope and out-of-scope schools for the surveys conducted at the school level. The data comparisons in this report at the individual school level took account of scope.

For the LMC survey, in-scopes were schools with libraries and reporting at least certain items. The items were:

- at least two of the following were reported - number of certified library media specialists, number of professionals working in the library who were not certified, number of other paid employees working in the library (clerks, aides, etc.), whether volunteers worked in the library; and
- there were values for at least 30 percent of these items: Items 2, 5, 6, 7, 10a, 11a, 12, 13, 14a, 15, 16a, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21a, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27 or 28.

For the LMS survey, in-scopes were schools with a library media specialist/librarian and reporting at least certain items. The items were:

- the year the respondent began working as an elementary or secondary school librarian, and
- at least one part of the educational background section, and
- whether or not the respondent was state certified, and
- there were values for at least 30 percent of these items: Items 1, 3, 8, 9, 10a, 11, 15a, 16a, 16b, 18a, 19, 20, 23a, 24, 25, 26a, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34 or 36.

Out-of-scopes were cases where there was no school or no library, or for the LMS survey, no librarian.

If the school did not meet the criteria for out-of-scope or in-scope, then it was a nonrespondent. Nonrespondents were nonresponses and insufficient responses: the school had a library (LMC survey) or librarian (LMS survey) but the remainder of the survey

responses were insufficient for inclusion in the tabulated data.

Out-of-scope cases had weights greater than zero if the school reported no library. Otherwise, the weight for an out-of-scope case was zero. Nonrespondent cases had no weights, that is, zero for the weight.

### *Scope and Available Data*

For the LMC survey nonrespondents, there were 350 public, 360 private and 15 BIA schools that reported a library, and 63 public, 101 private and zero BIA schools with a blank for this item. All other data for the nonrespondent schools were blanked. These schools were included in some comparisons.

For the LMC survey out-of-scope schools, a “no,” there was no library, response remained in the record. All other data for the record were blanked. There were 184 public, 262 private and 10 BIA school cases where the case was out-of-scope and the no box was selected. These cases were used in some data comparisons.

For the LMS survey nonrespondents, all data were intended to be blanked. There were 11 nonrespondent public schools where the LMS survey item asking for the respondent’s main assignment was not blanked. One of these respondents was an itinerant librarian and 10 were full-time librarians. There were five of these cases for the private schools and one for the BIA schools. These cases were used in some comparisons.

For the LMS survey out-of-scope schools, the data indicating the respondent’s main assignment may be kept. These data were kept if the respondent indicated the primary function of a classroom teacher, other professional staff, volunteer, library aide or support staff. These 291 public school, 376 private school and 20 BIA school cases were used in some comparisons.

Also, check boxes indicating the respondent was a librarian may or may not be blanked depending on other responses according to the specifications. Five public school cases, three itinerant librarians and two full timers, were not blanked. These cases also were used in some comparisons. All other data were blanked for the out-of-scope schools.

The 371 public, 465 private and 18 BIA schools that were out-of-scope on the LMC surveys also were out-of-scope on the LMS surveys. There were 480 public, 712 private and 31 BIA schools that were in-scope on

the LMC survey, but out-of-scope on the LMS survey. There were no cases of schools that were out-of-scope on the LMC survey and in-scope on the LMS survey. These cases were all found to be valid.

It should be noted that if a school was classified out-of-scope on the SASS survey, it was classified as out-of-scope on the LMC and LMS surveys. This would override the procedure for assignment of scope shown in Appendix E. There were 57 cases where a school on the LMC survey was originally coded in-scope based on survey responses but then made out-of-scope based on the SASS survey.

#### *Counts by Scope Reconciled Between Tables*

The following discussion demonstrates how to reconcile counts of schools by scope between tables. The discussion focuses on public schools but the analysis may be applied to the tables for private and BIA schools.

Table 3-1 and 3-4 show data for the LMC and LMS surveys. Table 3-1 shows counts of state-certified library media specialists and Table 3-4 shows counts of professional staff for in-scope public schools. The

count of nonrespondent schools for the LMC survey on each table adds to 206. The count of nonrespondents for the LMS survey on each table adds to 272. Note that each table shows 125 for entities that were nonrespondents on both surveys.

Table 1-3 shows counts of schools by scope for the LMS survey. The count for in-scope and nonrespondent public schools adds to 2,217. This is the total count of schools shown on Tables 3-1 and 3-4. The count of nonrespondent public schools is 272 on Table 1-3 and the same on Tables 3-1 and 3-4.

Table 2-1 shows counts of libraries for the public school LMC survey compared to the SASS survey. Table 1-2 is a listing of counts of schools by scope for the LMC survey. The total count of public schools on Table 2-1 is 5,026, the number of schools on the public school LMC survey. This can be verified by Table 1-2. The number of nonrespondent schools on Table 2-1 is 350 for those that reported a library and 63 for nonrespondents. These match the counts in Table 1-2.

Why are there 413 LMC nonrespondent public schools on Table 2-1, but 206 on Tables 3-1 and 3-4? Because Table 2-1 shows all LMC public schools while Tables 3-1 and 3-4 show only the LMC public schools that linked to the LMS survey.

**Appendix E. Scope for the LMC and LMS Surveys -- Procedure for Assignment**

***The LMC Survey***

A. Assign out-of-scope if:

1. The school no longer exists or the school does not have a library.

AND

2. All of the Item 1a detail, Item 1b detail, Item 1c detail, Item 1d detail and Items 2 through 28 are blank or not available.

AND

3. All of the Item 1a total, Item 1b total, Item 1c total and Item 1d total are blank or 0 or not available.

B. Assign in-scope if:

1. The conditions for out-of-scope are not met.

AND

2. Any two of the following four conditions are met:

- a. The Item 1a none or total boxes are blank or not available OR
- b. The Item 1b none or total boxes are blank or not available OR
- c. The Item 1c none or total boxes are blank or not available OR
- d. Item 4a has a response of “yes” or “no.”

AND

3. At least 23 of the fields in the following items are not equal to blank or not available:

Item 2, Item 5, Item 6, Item 7, Item 10a, Item 11a, Item 12, Item 13, Item 14a, Item 15, Item 16a, Item 17, Item 18, Item 19<sup>35</sup>, Item 20, Item 21a, Items 23 through 28.

C. Assign nonrespondent if:

1. The conditions for out-of-scope are not met.

AND

2. The conditions for in-scope are not met.

***The LMS Survey***

A. Assign out-of-scope if:

1. The school no longer exists or the school does not have a library or librarian, AND all of Items 3 through 36 are blank or not available.

OR

2. Item 2 contains a positive response to Check Box 5, 6, 7, 8 or 9.

B. Assign in-scope if:

1. The conditions for out-of-scope are not met.

AND

2. Item 2 contains a positive response to Check Box 1, 2, 3 or 4.

AND

3. Item 7 is not equal to not available.

AND

4. Any of the following conditions is met:

- a. Item 12 is a “yes” or “no” OR
- b. Item 13a is a “yes” or “no” OR
- c. Item 14a is a “no” OR
- d. Item 14b contains a positive response.

AND

5. Item 17a is a “yes” or “no.”

AND

6. At least 11 of the fields in the following items are not equal to blank or not available:

Item 1, Item 3, Item 8, Item 9<sup>50</sup>, Item 10a, Item 11, Item 15a, Item 16a<sup>50</sup>, Item 16b, Item 18a, Item 19<sup>50</sup>, Item 20, Item 23a, Item 24, Item 25, Item 26a, Item 26b except number 4, Item 27<sup>50</sup>, Items 28 through 33, Item 34<sup>50</sup>, Item 36.

C. Assign nonrespondent if:

1. The conditions for out-of-scope are not met.

AND

2. The conditions for in-scope are not met.

---

<sup>35</sup>Count as one if any of the fields are blank or not available.

**Appendix F. Counts of Library Media Center Staff Across Surveys**

<b>Survey</b>	<b>Library Media Specialists - Full Time</b>	<b>Library Media Specialists - Part Time</b>	<b>Other Professionals</b>	<b>Library Aides and Clerks</b>	<b>Television Studios</b>	<b>Computer Learning Laboratory</b>
LMS	1,319	642 <sup>2</sup>	101	185	NA	NA
LMC	3,308 <sup>3</sup>	843	1,045 <sup>4</sup>	3,276	967	2,253
SASS	6,824	2,071	NA <sup>5</sup>	6,442	NA	NA
CCD	50,501		37,915		NA	NA

Abbreviations:

- CCD = Common Core of Data Survey
- LMC = Library Media Center Survey
- LMS = Library Media Specialist/Librarian Survey
- SASS = Schools and Staffing Survey
- NA = Not available

Notes:

1. The nonfiscal CCD survey is the universe of all public schools. The SASS survey is a sample of the nonfiscal CCD universe. The LMC and LMS surveys are samples of the SASS survey.
2. Data include itinerant and substitute librarians, all of whom were assumed to be part time.
3. Data include state-certified library media specialists only.
4. Data include librarians who are not state certified.
5. Data are included in the counts of library media specialists.

Sources:

- 1993–94 Library Media Center Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)
- 1993–94 Library Media Specialist/Librarian Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)
- 1993–94 Schools and Staffing Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)
- 1993–94 Common Core of Data Survey data file (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics)

Appendix G  
Survey Forms

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Indian School Library Media Center Questionnaire. School Year 1993-94. National Center for Education Statistics. U.S. Department of Education.

Indian School Library Media Specialist/Librarian Questionnaire. School Year 1993-94. National Center for Education Statistics. U.S. Department of Education.

Indian School Questionnaire Schools and Staffing Survey. Survey Year 1993-94. National Center for Education Statistics. U.S. Department of Education.

The National Public Education Financial Survey. School Year 1993-94. National Center for Education Statistics. U.S. Department of Education.

The Nonfiscal Surveys of the Common Core of Data. School Year 1993-94. National Center for Education Statistics. U.S. Department of Education.

Private School Library Media Center Questionnaire. School Year 1993-94. National Center for Education Statistics. U.S. Department of Education.

Private School Library Media Specialist/Librarian Questionnaire. School Year 1993-94. National Center for Education Statistics. U.S. Department of Education.

Private School Questionnaire Schools and Staffing Survey. School Year 1993-94. National Center for Education Statistics. U.S. Department of Education.

Public School Library Media Center Questionnaire. School Year 1993-94. National Center for Education Statistics. U.S. Department of Education.

Public School Library Media Specialist/Librarian Questionnaire. School Year 1993-94. National Center for Education Statistics. U.S. Department of Education.

Public School Questionnaire Schools and Staffing Survey. School Year 1993-94. National Center for Education Statistics. U.S. Department of Education.

School Library Media Centers in the United States. School Year 1990-91. National Center for Education Statistics. U.S. Department of Education.

Teacher Demand and Shortage Questionnaire for Public School Districts (LEAs) Schools and Staffing Survey. School Year 1993-94. National Center for Education Statistics. U.S. Department of Education.